ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01735 9370

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1870

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1870.

VOLUME LII.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXII.

D. D. WHEDON, D.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
CARLTON & LANAHAN.
SAN FRANCISCO: E. THOMAS.
CINCINNATI: HITCHCOCK & WALDEN.
1870.

N 706202

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LII.

1870.

JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

ERNEST RENAN..... 5
Rev. GEORGE PEPPERS, A. M., Hyde Park, Mass.

ON THE POWER OF MIND OVER NATURE..... 29
B. F. COCKER, D. D., Prof. in University of Michigan.

HOLY SCRIPTURE A DIVINE REVELATION..... 45
From the German of Dr. P. KLEINERT. Translated by Dr. J. F. HURST.

MATHEMATICS AS AN EDUCATIONAL INSTRUMENT..... 65
Prof. A. SCHUYLER, M. A., Baldwin University, Berea, O.

THE BIBLE BETTER THAN THE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL..... 84
E. L. FANCHER, Esq., New York.

THE TWENTY-SECOND PSALM..... 98
F. G. HIBBARD, D. D., Rochester, N. Y.

INSPIRATION OF ALL SCRIPTURE. 2 TIM. iii, 16..... 110
Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 118

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 123

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 134

QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE..... 139

APRIL NUMBER.

GENERAL CONFERENCE OF 1844..... 165
J. T. PECK, D. D., Albany, N. Y.

POLITICS AND THE PULPIT..... 189
Rev. Prof. STIFLER, Genesee College, Lima, N. Y.

ROMANISM AND THE COMMON SCHOOL SYSTEM..... 204
Rev. ABEL STEVENS, LL. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

ON THE POWER OF MIND OVER NATURE..... 221
B. F. COCKER, D. D., Professor in University of Michigan.

MINISTERIAL TRANSFERS..... 235
Rev. DAVID SHERMAN, Willbraham, Mass.

DID THE "CHURCH SOUTH" SECEDE?..... 243
Rev. I. A. WILSON, D. D., Bristol, R. I.

WESLEY'S SEPARATION FROM THE MORAVIANS..... 265
[*An Appendix to Dr. L. S. Jacoby's new History of Methodism.*]
Translated by W. F. WARREN.

JOSEPHUS AND APION..... 274
ENOCH POND, D. D., Bangor, Maine.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 285

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 288

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 290

QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE..... 293

JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

MOMMSEN'S HISTORY OF ROME..... 325
Rev. Henry M. Baird, Ph.D., University of the City of New York.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING AND AIM OF MATTHEW XXIV, 1–36. 350
Cyrus Brooks, D.D., St. Paul, Minnesota.

THE TWENTY-SECOND PSALM. [Second Paper.]..... 360
F. G. Hibbard, D.D., Rochester, N. Y.

SOUTHERN RECONSTRUCTION..... 379
N. E. Cobleigh, D.D., Athens, Tenn.

THE EARNEST *VERSUS* THE EASY MINISTER..... 397
Rev. L. R. Dunn, Elizabeth, N. J.

TRAINING OF DEAF MUTES..... 416
E. K. Fiske, D.D., Chaplain of House of Refuge, Randall's Island, N. Y.

THE METHODIST HYMN BOOK AND ITS ASSOCIATIONS..... 423

Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 443
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 450
Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 455
Quarterly Book-Table..... 460

OCTOBER NUMBER.

DE GROOT ON GNOSTIC TESTIMONIES TO THE NEW TESTAMENT... 485
H. M. Harmon, D.D., Professor in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

THE MUSCOVITE AND THE TEUTON..... 510
Professor Wells, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

OUR SPOKEN ENGLISH..... 526
Professor D. H. Wheeler, N. W. University, Evanston, Illinois.

ORIENTAL INFLUENCE ON WESTERN THOUGHT AND CIVILIZATION..... 545
W. H. Withrow, A.M., Toronto, Ontario.

THE ETHICS OF LATIN COMEDY..... 562
Professor Harrington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

WUTTKE ON GREEK ETHICS IN THEIR GOLDEN AGE..... 573
Translated by Professor Lacroix, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 598
Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 601
Quarterly Book-Table..... 604

Methodist Quarterly Review.

JANUARY, 1870.

Art. I.—ERNEST RENAN.

Œuvres Complètes d'Ernest Renan. Chez Michel Lévy Frères. Paris. 1869.
Nouveaux Lundis. Par C. A. Sainte-Beuve. Chez Michel Lévy. Tome Deuxième. Paris. 1866.
L'Athéisme Scientifique. Par M. Laurentie. Chez Lagny Frères. Paris. 1862.

The recent appearance of his elaborate treatise on Saint Paul draws public attention afresh to Monsieur Renan. This new work bears the same general character as its immediate predecessors, "The Life of Jesus" and "The Apostles." Yet its tone is more sober, and its combined research and learning seem more mature and fruitful. It may be hoped, too, that the time has now come for a calm, impartial, and thorough examination of the man and his works. The circumstances which first attracted general attention to him were surely not such as he would have chosen. A person of quiet temper, retiring in manner, scholarly in taste, hostile to vulgarity, and devoted to a class of studies which but few pursue and are competent to judge, of course he would have chosen the kind of consideration which best accords with his nature—an unruffled, thoughtful appreciation. It was a strange, if not entirely undeserved, misfortune which revealed him to the general public in the dust and noise of angry controversy.

His ambition was natural. Its chief designs were to become Professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages in the College of France, and to write a history of the Origin of Christianity.

When the death of Étienne Quatremère, in 1857, left the chair of Hebrew and its cognate languages in the College of France vacant, Renan aspired to its possession. He paid the customary visits to the professors of that institution, and announced his desire to become their colleague. By their suffrages and those of the members of the Academy of Inscriptions, he was designated to the Minister of Public Instruction as the most competent among the candidates for that position. This course is prescribed by custom for the appointment of professors in the College of France. It is usual for the gift of the position to immediately succeed the nomination. In this case the minister hesitated. Another person was temporarily charged with the duties of the chair, and the appointment was held under advisement. After four years' delay, the coveted position was conferred. The opening lecture was the occasion of a tempestuous scene. Popular feeling ran so high that the authorities suspended his lectures. Renan refused to resign, collected classes at his rooms, trained them carefully, and received the salary of professor. Other places were offered him instead of the one he held. These he firmly refused. The Government attempted various conciliatory measures, but, finding them all in vain, issued a decree, after long delay, that removed him from his chair. These events first drew general attention to Renan.

The publication of "The Life of Jesus" shortly after these transactions renewed his popularity, and secured him a careful hearing wherever the great critical problems of Christianity are discussed. This work was read as no other Life of Jesus ever was read. A storm of review articles, pamphlets, and formal refutations followed. Men praised him, blamed him, mocked him, and abused him. Nearly all misconceived him. In all this tumult of empty words and misdirected declamation, Renan has maintained a noble attitude. With his trained and brilliant pen, recrimination would often have been easy, and retort natural and effective. Voltaire would never have missed such a chance for a showy though transient victory. Renan has not broken silence in reply. His moderation has not been free from a touch of disdain; he takes pains to let the world know that those who triumph over him so easily, do so because he *permits* their exultation.

Ernest Renan was born, in 1823, at Tréguier, in Basse-Bretagne. The region of Brittany is the seat, in France, of that Celtic race whose good qualities and defects he has celebrated in more than one passage of royal splendor. We may find our advantage in comparing Renan with his kinsmen in race, and especially with Châteaubriand and Lamennais. How earnest all these men are! Whether Châteaubriand tremble on the verge of Atheism or sob before the Cross—whether Lamennais preach reform in the church or vent his skepticism in conversation—whether Renan study for the priesthood or write "The Life of Jesus"—what hauteur in them all! You light on the same self-sufficiency, loftiness, inflexibility in their bearing. Note how natural disdain is to these kinsmen in flesh and soul.

Renan was the child of a sea-faring family. He was their latest born; twelve years younger than the next preceding child, that beloved sister whom he lost at ancient Byblos. He was left mainly to the care and companionship of his mother and sister in early life. His education was conducted till his sixteenth year in a seminary, near their home, under ecclesiastical direction. The instructors were country priests of grave manners and solid learning. Such success crowned these early studies that high expectations were awakened. He was sent to Paris to reside in a little seminary under the care of Abbé (now Archbishop) Dupanloup. The Abbé belonged to the liberal wing of French Catholicism. This party seeks to combine literature, science, political freedom, and earnest piety. To it adhered, among others, Gratry, Montalembert, and Lacordaire. Its choice spirits frequently met in the drawing-room of the well-known Madame Swetchine. There conversation had free play; though the existence of a private chapel in the house, and serious efforts for the conversion of its unbelieving frequenters, imposed an unwelcome restraint even on so tolerant a visitor as Sainte-Beuve. It is easy to conceive that, in a seminary guided by priests of such tendencies, the youthful Renan found himself in a new atmosphere. He felt the change without precisely realizing its nature. But sixteen on coming to Paris, his hour had not yet struck. In this seminary he passed three calm and studious years; thence he was transferred to Saint-Sulpice, to pursue his philosophical studies, for two years, in the establishment at Issy.

Surrounded by learned and original men, his own free, intellectual development now took its rise. At Issy he began to indulge a strong taste for natural science; hence sprang his earliest doubts on theological questions. They were too superficial to occasion him much trouble. Closing his philosophical studies, he was transferred to the seminary at Paris for his theological training. Put to the study of the old theology of Saint-Thomas, "rehandled and triturated by thirty Sorbonnic generations," his critical sense roused up and took alarm. The questions, objections, and answers coldly flung at him from the professor's chair awakened an intellectual revolt. But he continued his Hebrew studies under M. Lehir with profit, and permission was given him, as a special favor, to attend the lectures of Quatremère, the Hebraist, in the College of France. Going and coming, he heard much that was strange to him—portentous echoes from the outer world. He was, meantime, studying German authors. These opened a new and astonishing world to his view: especially Herder attracted and influenced him. Thus two years of theological study passed away; then arose another very practical question. Delay with the answer was not possible much longer; it haunted his studious hours, and meddled with all his plans for the future. He must find a *yea* or *nay* for the question, Will Monsieur Renan become a priest? Just before the third and last year of his theologic training, after much dubitation, he said, No! This resolution was communicated to his superiors. They sent him to live at College Stanislas, with Père Gratry: the learning and instructions of that amiable priest produced no effect on the resolute youth; every real bond between himself and the Church was now sundered. He took lodgings in the quarter of Sainte-Jacques, and set up as private tutor. His beloved sister hastened to Paris to spare him all temporal anxieties.

Sainte-Beuve, from whom we derive these details, and who drew them directly from Renan, dwells with pleasure on this event:

The character of this intellectual emancipation, he says, deserves to be well understood and defined. In one sense, there was no struggle, tempest, or laceration: for him there was no solemn day, hour, or moment when the vail of the temple was rent before his eyes: it was no counterpart of Saint Paul, who was cast down, overturned on the way to Damascus, and at the same stroke con-

verted. Philosophy did not appear to him some fine morning or evening like an armed Minerva; she did not announce herself with a burst of thunder as came to pass, we fancy, with Lamennais, and perhaps with Jouffroy. He underwent no battle-sweat, like Jacob wrestling with the angel, nor any solitary watch of agony. There was nothing like that. If there was laceration it was of another kind—in personal relations. Doubtless it was painful and sorrowful to him to separate from respectable men with whom he was connected by affectionate and grateful feelings; he suffered from having to announce an irrevocable, and, to them, afflictive resolution. He was timid, shy in manner. The man whom we hear to-day expressing himself with such firmness, vigor, and neatness, never hesitating in the shade of his expressions, then had much hesitation in form, much modesty to surmount. And then, his Breton heart was tender, and could not remain entirely insensible to this slowly-produced but decisive and returnless divorce from the vanishing creed of his cradle and youth. It cost him much to separate from things as well as from men. But, this once over, he had nothing more to do in his intellectual life but grow and ripen; he had passed through, not a revolution, but an evolution. The modern scientific spirit had gradually seized and gained him, like light that rises along the horizon and without delay fills up the void.

It is almost worth conversion, or emancipation, to have it painted by a hand like that! What serenity of mind in this change that sets in calm and fatal as sunrise in its apparition! What exquisite delicacy of feeling in Renan toward the respectable men from whom he breaks, nay, turns slowly, lingeringly away! The sweet and solemn majesty of Truth alone beckons him on in his inevitable career. A thousand pities that Sainte-Beuve—he who has so skillfully turned the soul of Châteaubriand inside out for our inspection—did not think best to give us more details on this interesting theme! There are certain terms which Sainte-Beuve employs in this description which we should gladly see, not explained, for we understand them well enough, but shown to be just in their application. The divorce from Christian faith was "fatal, returnless, an evolution." The expression is not accidental. In several places Renan speaks of his present views as the fatal result of his intellectual progress. He tells us that those who have grown up to these views will adopt them, and that really no others *can*.

If any body comes to our principles, it will be because he has the turn of mind and the education needful for reaching them;

our best efforts will not give this education and turn of mind to those who do not possess them.

In his very just appreciation of Lamennais he says:

He seems to have abandoned Catholicism rather on the ground of personal grievances than through the fatal progress of his mind; study then revealed to him scientific reasons for the step he had taken under the impulse of passion.

In another passage, still speaking of Lamennais, these words occur:

If, instead of forsaking Christianity for reasons in which the share of policy and passion was greater than that of cold reason, he had forsaken it by the royal path of history and criticism, perhaps he would have preserved his peace.

It cannot be doubted that Renan, as he penned these lines, mentally opposed his own abandonment of Christianity, as a model in that kind, to the faulty and not completely sincere proceeding of Lamennais. Sainte-Beuve confirms this conclusion when he writes:

In a word, Renan, passing from dogma to science, presents the most notable contrast with Lamennais: he is a young, gradual, seasonably enlightened Lamennais, without tempest or hurricane; a progressive and not a volcanic Lamennais. . . . His gravity, his dignity, and, I may say, his intellectual movement, experienced no disturbance or derangement from a sincere, natural change, appearing in its due season, according to the course of things, by virtue of a generous and necessary crisis.

We come at every turn upon the same assertion, under different forms, of the absolute necessity of this change in Renan's opinions. No objection need be made to the correctness and sincerity of such statements. The only complaint to be offered turns on another matter. In an article on Châteaubriand's Life of Rancé, the celebrated founder of La Trappe, Sainte-Beuve recounts that once, in his dissipated youth, Rancé barely escaped death from an assassin's bullet. Then he comments on Rancé's exclamation, "What would have become of me had God this moment called me away!" in the following terms:

Thus in those days, happier in that respect than ours, there was faith even in dissipated souls, in the depth of their wantonness; whatever the surface and the heaving waves might be, deep below there was faith. . . To-day, almost every-where, even where there

is an appearance of an honest and philosophically avowable faith, there is doubt at bottom.

It seems clear from all this, that skepticism has become the natural atmosphere of the good minds of our time—of all who are imbued with the spirit of modern science! There should be no complaint of the seeming arrogance of pretending that only a defective education, want of maturity, or lack of some special bent of mind, could retain men like Guizot, Gladstone, Faraday, Pressensé, Tholuck, and Montalembert in bondage to faith in the supernatural. The positive, scientific faith is now quite as much exposed to such systematic impertinence as ever dogmatic faith was. But if we have passed through a revolution of this kind, so that doubt is now the prevailing atmosphere of intellectual life and faith the exceptional condition, a new duty is imposed on those who abandon Christian creeds. They owe those they leave, not less than those they join, the most minute and comprehensive accounts of these inevitable changes. That these are the fatal results of expanding thought, of increasing wisdom, should be most carefully shown. The earliest doubts, and how they were for a time quieted—what renewed and multiplied these doubts, and how they affected the dogmas of religion—the extension of skepticism from one object to another—the gradual and resistless surging in of new convictions to exclude the former ones—in what particulars the earlier views were untenable and in what the new ones are more free from contradiction—these are all points on which we need light. Especially should the delusive notion be dismissed that these ideas are only fitted to impress and convince the elect few. Renan's scheme of thought, if he would only define it simply, is not beyond the reach of sophomoric brains. If these high priests of the new system would but analyze the process of their relapse from faith to positive science, as vividly as Luther, Augustine, and John Henry Newman have analyzed their conversion, they would confer a priceless boon on the world. But while they conceal the reasons of a change of opinion which they proclaim unavoidable—while they respond to our inquiries with a suggestion of our unfitness to judge such high matters—we may be pardoned for surmising that they may be as faulty in their reasoning as they show themselves defective in good-breeding. Take the case of Renan

in illustration. It appears that at nineteen he had stumbled on certain doubts arising from what could only have been a very superficial acquaintance with natural science. Their nature is not disclosed, but we are left to infer that they involved a conflict between science and the Bible. We ought to be informed here what his difficulties were, what his views on the relations of science and revelation, what his notions on the inspiration of the Scriptures, whether faith in him was a simple traditional assent to Catholic dogmas or a vital relation to Christ, God revealed to the heart, to use Pascal's definition. Thus we might learn what he had rejected. When he resolved not to become a priest what were his exact objections? With what feelings did he look forward to the priesthood? Was he pleased with the prospect of exchanging his facilities for study in Paris, its stimulating intellectual life and brilliant society, for some remote and monotonous parish with a ceaseless round of petty and harassing duties? Was he dreaming of a literary career? Did he turn to the University and the Institute because conscience forbade him to enter the priesthood, or did he forsake the Church because fairer prospects smiled upon him from other quarters?

The account of this transition which Sainte-Beuve has drawn from Renan is even more full of contradiction than the story of Saint Paul's conversion. One Gospel never contradicted another so squarely as some of the assertions of Sainte-Beuve contradict the statements of Renan. Two pages before his declaration of the fatal nature of the change we are discussing, this amiable critic shows us another phase of the business. Renan "felt that, had he been born in Germany, he might have found stations propitious to respectful and independent study, without being obliged to break absolutely with venerable names and things, by the aid of a happy confusion of poetry with the religion of the past." But a few weeks later the objections which had previously hovered over his mind assumed a fixed and precise form. We confess that doubts which can be so plastic one month and so inflexible the next, according to the outward circumstances of the doubter, hardly seem to result from the fatal development of his mind. There is room to think that the change of attitude witnessed in those few weeks was due quite as much to additional will as to additional light.

On what grounds did this youth of two-and-twenty, less than two years after his first serious doubts, settle the great question of supernatural religion? Those two years had been spent in the study of theology, of Hebrew under Lehir and at the lectures of Quatremère. What knowledge of natural science could he have gained in that time? Could he have mastered the methods and results of German theology at that early date? Had he been tenfold the prodigy he is, this would have been impossible. We dwell on this matter because of the importance which has been assigned to it as a sign of the times. Renan himself says, that few become unbelievers for good reasons, and he claims a scientific cause for his own unbelief. It is, then, our right and duty to be strict. On all the points named absolute sincerity would require ample details.

We have seen how calm and peaceful this evolution was, silent as the rising of the heavenly constellations, grand and inevitable as the swelling tides of the ocean, in the account Renan gave of it, in 1862, to Sainte-Beuve. But he appears to have forgotten a little what he had said on the same topic thirteen years earlier, and only four years after the events described: "I wish all my friends who remain in Orthodoxy a peace comparable with that in which I have lived since my struggle came to its close, and the appeased tempest has left me in the midst of this great pacific ocean, a shoreless and waveless sea, where the only star is reason, and the only compass my own heart." "Fatal distinction"—of sacred and profane— . . . "What struggles did it not cost me!"* Here the conflict was not from the necessity of sundering friendly relations or ties of gratitude; it lay where Sainte-Beuve says there was none in his intellectual difficulties and processes. Of course, the earlier account is the more trustworthy. This discrepancy comes from no purpose of concealment or disguise. When years have passed away since the occurrence of such events, that great magician, the imagination, clothes them with hues that often contrast with the reality. Then, too, Renan was not the literary artist in 1849 that he had become in 1862. Indeed, what statement of that nature could pass through the transfiguring hands of two writers like Renan and Sainte-

* "Questions Contemporaines," p. 313.

Beuve, without some suppressions of unpleasing features, some beautifying additions or arrangements?

But this change had made Renan a tutor, and compelled him to cast about himself for a career. His studies in the Semitic literatures went on, though not without some hesitation. The University attracted him, and, in 1848, he tried his hand at instruction in philosophy. This was given up, it appears, through lack of confidence in the methods and results of philosophical study. He turned to the Academies, and competed in learned dissertations for the prizes offered by The Institute. One of these carried off the Volney Prize in 1847; it was afterward expanded into a "General History of the Semitic Languages." Another successful, but still unpublished, essay, treated "The Study of Greek in the Occident during the Middle Ages." In 1848 he published a remarkable study on "The Origin of Language;" in 1850 he was designated by the Academy of Inscriptions for a learned mission in Italy, the fruit of which commission appeared, two years later, in his "Averroës and Averroïsm." He gained admission to the *Revue des Deux Mondes* in 1851, and to the *Journal des Débats* in 1852. History, literature, and art furnished him themes for a series of learned, suggestive, and brilliant essays. He thus made himself felt as a thinker of original power and a writer of high ability. He has since published translations of the "Book of Job" and "The Song of Songs," "Studies in Religious History," "Essays in Morals and Criticism," "Contemporary Questions," and "The Share of the Semitic Nations in the History of Civilization;" the last, his inaugural lecture as Hebrew Professor in the College of France. Three volumes of his "History of the Origin of Christianity" have already appeared under the titles, "Life of Jesus," "The Apostles," and "Saint Paul." In two additional volumes, "The Antichrist" and "The Last Apostolic Men," the author hopes to complete, ere five years are gone, this great work, to which he has deliberately reserved the ripest years of his life.

These works all reveal an intellect of marked power, competent learning, great literary skill, and delicate poetic sensibility. In his critiques on "Ary Scheffer's Temptation of Christ," "Lamennais," "The Author of the Imitation of Christ," "The Acta Sanctorum," "The Poetry of the Expo-

sition," and "The Poetry of the Celtic Nations," Renan shows an exquisite sensibility to artistic and poetic merits. Yet he has his reserves, even here. In Béranger he scourges remorselessly the wantonness of French verse. That peaceful old bard, so chaste, temperate, and respectable in reality, who puts on lechery, drunkenness, and disreputable airs with his singing-robes, moves him to anger. Tennyson, Milton, Racine, Longfellow, these and such as they, would be his poetic favorites. But Rabelais, Pulci, Byron, and even Molière, with his peals of inextinguishable and immortal laughter, would find little favor with him. It was well, he thinks, that Molière was not admitted to the Academy. It would have pained Renan to have seen the old comedian and playwright ruffling the dignity of Racine or Bossuet. In his pieces on Ewald's History of the Israelites, the Critical Historians of Jesus, and Comparative Mythology, Renan seems too absolutely at the mercy of the authors he reviews for his information and conclusions. He more than once excuses himself for not discussing important questions with a greater display of critical apparatus. Others have destroyed, he will build; the writer gets the start of the critic. But we must now ask what conclusions Renan has reached on the vital questions of Christianity.

It is to be regretted that the date of its composition is not appended to each of his productions. We might then study his development as a thinker at our leisure. Yet this aid is not indispensable. More than most men, like Lamennais, like Châteaubriand, his kinsmen in race, Renan is capable of passing at a bound from one pole of thought to its opposite. How it was in 1845 we cannot tell, but two years later he held the same ideas in the main that he holds to-day. Could we know what books he read in this interval, we should have no little light on the secret formation of his opinions. It does not seem very probable that he ever accepted the Hegelian philosophy. Indeed, he condemns Strauss for having made, in his Life of Jesus, an application of Hegelianism to the story of the Gospels. It seems probable that Renan read this book in Littré's French translation. He usually refers to the work in that guise; and what he draws attention to, and most freely lauds, are not the contents proper of the volume, but the fine analyses that Littré has prefixed to it. References are frequent to Littré's articles

in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*—articles that also treat the question of the supernatural. Now Littré is the one man of high position in literary France who has unreservedly accepted the doctrines of the late Auguste Comte. Others accept him in part, and partly reject him, as though he were like other men; Littré cannot treat him thus. He calls Comte master, and confesses himself obliged in respect to him to a disciple's duty. That yoke of bondage which J. S. Mill put from him, Littré exults to assume. Accordingly Renan joins them in rejecting the supernatural. Man knows only what comes under human inspection. Let us hear Renan himself:

The more we penetrate the origin of the human mind, the better shall we understand that miracles of every sort are only *the unexplained;* that to produce the phenomena of primitive humanity, there is no need of a God for ever meddling with the course of things, and that these phenomena are the regular development of laws as immutable as reason and perfection. . . . It is not from any one argument, but from the whole mass of the modern sciences, that the vast result proceeds that *there is no supernatural.* Since there has been existence, whatever has taken place in the world of phenomena has been the regular development of the laws of existence, laws which constitute but one order of government, nature, both physical and moral. Whoever says *above* or *without nature,* utters a contradiction, as though one should say *super*-divine in the order of substances. Littré well says, "In rejecting the supernatural, the modern world has not acted of set purpose, for it received its tradition with that of the fathers, always so dear and well guarded, but without desiring or seeking it, by the simple fact of a development of which that conclusion was the result. An experience which nothing has ever come to contradict has taught us, that whatever miraculous things have been told, constantly had their origin in a startled imagination, complacent credulity, and in ignorance of natural laws." Never has a miracle taken place where it could be observed and attested.* There are miracles only where men believe in them; it is faith that produces the supernatural. . . . It is not in the name of any given philosophy, it is in the name of a constant experience, that we banish miracles from history. We do not say "Miracles are impossible;" we say, "Hitherto no miracle has been attested." Let a thaumaturgist present himself to-morrow with guarantees serious enough for discussion; let him announce that he is able, say, to raise the dead; what would be done? A committee of physiologists, physicists, chemists, and persons trained in critical history, would be named. This committee would select the corpse, name the hall where the experiment should be made, regulate the precautions

* "Études d'Histoire Religieuse," pp. 199-206.

needful to leave no place for doubt. If, under such conditions, the resurrection were wrought, a probability almost equal to certitude would be acquired. Yet, as an experiment must always be capable of repetition, as men should be capable of repeating what they have once done, and as there can be no question in miracles of easy or difficult, the thaumaturgist should be invited to repeat his marvelous act under other circumstances, on other corpses, in other places. Every time the miracle succeeded two things would be proved: first, that supernatural facts take place in the world; second, that the power of producing them belongs or is delegated to certain persons. But miracles are never seen taking place under such conditions.*

There is evidently some fluctuation of thought here. When Renan says, that it results from the sum total of modern science that there is no supernatural, he is cut off from saying, under the necessities of his argument, "We do not deny the possibility of miracles." That is the very thing which is denied. Yet the reason presented for the rejection of miracles is worthy of consideration; it is, that experience is uniformly against them. It is a "constant experience," "an experience which nothing has ever come to contradict," that is the reason of this rejection. This experience, too, must be that of scientific men, since otherwise Renan himself would be the first to deny its validity in this question. Who are to conduct the experiments that shall settle the problem? Men. And what, pray, are men? Creatures of brief earthly existence, and who, one half their lives, are incompetent to observe as scientists. What portion of human history is to be included in scientific ages? Perhaps Greece, in the few generations when her civilization opened in its high and unique perfection; perhaps Rome, in the Augustan period. That these, though civilized and literary periods of the highest character, would or should be accepted as scientific ages, we are by no means assured. But if they are not, then no nation or period of antiquity is entitled to that character. The Middle Ages, surely, were not scientific. Spain and Italy have never had such a period. Two centuries ago, England, Germany, and France were not scientific. Suppose, then, the scientific period to include the last century of the modern civilized world and a few generations of the highest Grecian and Roman intellectual development. The required experience

* "Vie de Jésus," Introduction, page xlii.

cannot be had apart from such times. Who are the men competent to undertake experiments of the nature proposed? Would England believe on the testimony of any other than a few of her most skillful scientists? Would the French Institute remit the matter to any ordinary hands? Would not the scientists of the world be summoned to sit as a jury should one now attempt to raise the dead? Suppose an ancient document was presented in confirmation of such a miracle done in Rome two thousand years, or in Athens twenty-five hundred years, ago. Let that document bear the signature of Aristotle and his co-laborers, or of Cicero and his intimate friends. Suppose the existence of such a parchment had been well known in ancient times, and its history down to the present moment familiar to all the learned, would the Institute then believe? Surely not. Virtually, then, the demand is that the modern world is not to believe in miracles because a few men of the last century have had no experience of them. But is this a "constant" experience, "an experience which nothing has ever come to contradict?" If we were asked to believe, on this ground, that for the last hundred years no miracles had appeared under the observation of the Institute, before the eyes of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, or at the desire of the Berlin Faculty of Medicine, the demand would be just and acceptable: but when we are therefore invited to admit that none have occurred elsewhere within that period, we can only reply that we do not know. When we are asked to extend that conclusion backward, so as to cover all ages of this world's existence, and the existence of all the worlds in the universe, we say again that we cannot tell. Indeed, we have many questions to ask. Whence came matter with its marvelous laws? What produced and feeds the forces of nature? Whence came animal and vegetable life? What was the origin of man on the globe? Does not science deny that these have always existed? Is there the least evidence before any learned body that such things ever rise into being under the laws that now rule the world? Why should we not say that such facts never came to pass, since we have no experience of them? When Renan affirms that nature created them, he defies experience quite as much as those who say that God created them. Can any assert that creation by a personal God is

less comprehensible than creation by blind and impersonal nature?

It might also be hinted that while natural science has its rights, it has no right to encroach on other domains. Is man's spiritual nature nothing? Dare science say that the soul does not exist, because her fingers are too clumsy to catch it, her analysis too material to reveal its nature, her eyes too dim to descry its destiny? Is psychology nothing? Is the soul's instinctive belief in God nothing? On this side we reach a very real and important influence on Renan's thinking, whose fountain-head is Auguste Comte. That strange, half-crazed, half-sagacious teacher treats theology and psychology as vagaries of the childhood of our race, incapable of resulting in any good, and destined to yield the ground entirely to the study of matter and its laws. The range of all real knowledge is found in mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, and sociology. Beyond these is the fantastic, unreal, and unhealthy, realm of dreams and chimera. It is something of a consolation to know that the dogma which compels Renan to reject Christian supernaturalism requires him to treat Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato, Locke, Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Cousin, and Hamilton as vain dreamers, whose science of the mind and of God has been without foundation in reality or beneficent influence on human happiness. If Renan will not go so far, it is not, as we shall see, because he ascribes any real, objective value to theology. True poet as he is, he knows the worth of imagination in its most varied forms.

From this stand-point we may easily perceive that the demand for the submission of miracles to scientific committees and tests cannot be very serious. The very terms of that demand prejudge the question in the most offensive way. The miracle-worker is already branded as a thaumaturgist; he must bring serious guarantees to men to whom none can be serious that do not emanate from themselves; he is assumed to have power to repeat his wonders at will, and for the most frivolous causes. If any would see how adroitly a scientific man can deny the most fully attested results of science on pretendedly scientific grounds, let him read the account of Pasteur's experiments on the question of spontaneous generation, and then note for what reasons Herbert Spencer still denies creation. No men are

more completely proof-proof than scientific theorists; none more completely and more frequently show a lack of that scientific spirit which delivers itself, bound hand and foot, to facts to be dragged whither they will. Then, too, the acceptance of miraculous works on the basis of experiments made under strict conditions, in the presence of scientific men, would hardly answer the avowed object of those miracles. A miracle at Paris would silence so many doubts, insinuates Renan. But would it silence doubts in London, Berlin, Vienna, Boston, Jerusalem, Mecca, Pekin, Jeddo, and Timbuctoo? Why should Paris be favored above other localities? Would the Paris of to-day be convinced by the attestation of a miracle wrought before the elect minds of the Paris of the last, or any past, century? Would the Paris of the next, or any future century, believe on the evidence of any of the preceding ages? Science is constantly perfecting her instruments, extending the domain of knowledge, combining facts so as to produce the most unexpected results. Surely every successive age would easily find plausible defects in the experiments, for which the miraculous result might be declared null. Should God pity the weakness of scientific minds so far as to come at their call to work miracles in every generation, his work, despite such condescension, would be held to have lost all miraculous character. The resurrection of the dead would be no more miraculous, if they were raised wherever scientific men would have them raised, than the sunrise and the ebbing of the ocean-tides.

Renan somewhere speaks of the shabby idea of Deity implied in the supposition of a divine interference in the critical moments of the history of the world. But his notion of a God who should come at the call of scientific committees—wait in ante-rooms till they have perfected their arrangements to catch him should he attempt any tricks of imposture or evasion—who comes in when they give the signal—does his supernatural work meekly at their behest, stands patiently by while they wrangle over the event, renews his display at their request, and then spreads out before mankind the certificate of the French Institute that he is God—let Renan worship him if he can—most men could contrive a better and a more sensible Deity. Compared with such a figure, how crowned with sublimity is the Jesus of the Gospels!

But let us further examine the share of experience in the system of Renan. He has employed it, if not thoroughly and consistently, at least with unflinching bravery. It would not be necessary to follow his steps so carefully, and support our assertions so diligently with express citations, were his works generally accessible to our public. This must excuse a somewhat prolix discussion. For once the game is worth the candle. Any denial of the possibility of the miracles of the Gospel must logically include the denial of *all* miracles. Especially must it embrace CREATION, the first of miracles. It must involve the negation of the divine creation of matter and the material universe; of animals, including man; and of angels and demons. Experience knows nothing of these supposed facts; but it is not content to say that it knows nothing.

To flee beyond history to periods where attestation is impossible, in order to shun the need of attesting historic miracles, is taking refuge behind a cloud, proving an obscure thing by something more obscure, disputing a known law on account of a fact with which we are unacquainted. People invoke miracles that took place before any witness existed, for want of being able to cite a well-attested miracle. . . . But these phenomena had their causes at the hour when they appeared. . . . If it is doubtful whether we shall ever succeed in artificially producing life, it is because the reproduction of the circumstances in which life began, if it did begin, may perhaps be always out of our power. How shall we bring back a planetary condition now vanished for thousands of years? How make an experiment that demands ages? . . . Surely the formation of humanity, if we suppose it sudden and instantaneous, is the most offensive and absurd thing in the world.* To recur to a supernatural intervention to explain facts which have become impossible in the present state of the world, is proof that we are ignorant of the concealed forces of spontaneity.†

Here is plainly enough a negation of any supernatural creation. But Renan is not satisfied with this negative result of experience; he puts forward a positive statement which can only be justified by the most conclusive facts in its favor. Yet he does not produce such facts, nor yield us the least hint where to seek them. "Science demonstrates that on a certain day, by virtue of natural laws which until then had presided over the development of things, without exception or exterior intervention, thinking beings appeared gifted with all their faculties,

* Les Apôtres, Introduction, p. 47. † Études d'Histoire Religieuse, p. 199.

and perfect in their essential elements."* We hear much, in this connection, of nature, natural laws, conditions of life, evolution through myriad ages, etc.; we shall presently see why we hear nothing of a Creator. It follows as an indispensable result of this theory of the inflexible government of the world by natural law, that Renan rejects all providential action in earthly things. How could he, who will not allow the operation of God's hand in making the world, admit a watchfulness of Deity over the petty, daily fortunes of the humblest of men? Kingdoms and empires, languages and civilizations, mythologies and religions, rise and fall without any notice from God. "Certainly the formation of Christianity is the greatest fact in the religious history of the world. But it is not therefore miraculous. Buddhism and Babism have had as numerous, enthusiastic, and resigned martyrs as Christianity."† We do not comment on this strange assertion, for a stranger one is soon to relieve us of that task. Experience so incapable of finding miracles in the origin of the world and of men, in the appearance of Christ and the foundation of the Church, cannot promise us much for the future. Experience knows only the past and the present. Let not the human race dream of obtaining from her lips an assurance of its immortality. But we are not to suppose that experience will be so modest in Renan's hands as to say nothing about our hopes of a future life. At the close of his long study on the Book of Job, Renan takes pains to tell us his convictions on this interesting topic. He thinks Job and his friends were without real light on the subject, and the three thousand years that separate them from us have made no additions to our knowledge. The future of individual man has grown no clearer. He who finds truth, who loves the beautiful, will be immortal; not in himself, however, but in his work. While the wicked and frivolous shall entirely perish, in the sense that they will transmit nothing to the future in the general result of the toil of their kind, the good and noble man shares in the immortality of what he has loved. The hope of the resurrection of the dead is a dream, vain as any that ever visited the brain of slumber. Never shall God have a desire to the work of his hands; never shall Jehovah call from the sky, and aroused humanity respond to that

* Études d'Histoire Religieuse, p. 217. † Les Apôtres, Introduction, p. 49.

call from the grave. Christ rotted in some obscure corner. He is not the first-fruits of them that sleep. Renan tells us that though obscurity enwraps the course of the world, it moves toward God. God, the heavenly Father, and similar terms, abound in his writings. It sometimes chances that he uses them in ways not strictly consistent with his real views. This happens on other themes than that which we now consider. Though his idea of immortality be such as we have just stated, yet he allows himself to say of Lamennais, "He now knows the key to the enigma which he so courageously tried to solve."* The dedication of "The Life of Jesus" to the pure spirit of his sister Henrietta, whom he had lost at Byblos, seems to imply faith in her continued existence. How else could he exclaim, "Reveal to me, O Good Genius—to me whom thou didst love—those truths which rule death, remove its fear, and almost make it beloved." This is sentiment, rhetoric, poesy, which its author loves as a fond illusion, not as pure reality. We need to affirm this the more distinctly and earnestly because Renan speaks of his sister's spirit as in the bosom of God. On this theme, where reverence and simplicity are enjoined, Renan appears to delight in mystification. Sainte-Beuve, whose critical sagacity nothing escapes, notes this disposition to give us a glowing but misleading image just where we want simple words. This critic, who knows how to insinuate adverse judgment in a compliment, condemns that procedure by saying that others praise it, while withholding his own applause. But men cannot always lose themselves in clouds, though they be the golden clouds of imagination. This happened to Renan. He who had one day spoken of "the mysterious affinity which we feel with the abyss, our father," and had also declared that "God does not reveal himself in miracles but to the heart,"† was once asked plumply what he meant by such words. M. Guéroult, of the *Opinion Nationale*, had not been able to understand the notions of Renan on our "feeling of obscure relations with the infinite, of a divine filiation." In these days the editor is father-confessor to every body; thus summoned, the author of "The Life of Jesus" was forced to respond. He said:

You admit that science cannot prove the existence of a free being, superior to man, intervening in nature to change its course.

* Essais de Morale et Critiq., p. 203. † Chaire d'Hebreu au Col. de France.

But, you add, can science prove positively that such a being does not exist? I shall not inquire whether we can metaphysically and *à priori* prove that. But the experimental proof suffices. Never has such a being revealed himself in a scientifically attested manner. When he shall reveal himself we will believe in him.*

This is surely explicit enough, and would apparently justify a charge of downright Atheism. But we here deal with a subtile intellect that must be heard to the end of the chapter. It is only by following him in all his winding paths, by listening to this and to that, and finally combining all you have learned, that you will ever surprise his real convictions. On the subject of Providence he speaks boldly:

Providence, understood in the vulgar fashion, is synonymous with thaumaturgy. The simple question is, whether God puts forth particular acts. For myself, I think that the true providence is not distinct from the constant, divine, clearly wise, just and good order of the laws of the universe.†

The connection here shows, that by "particular acts," Renan means acts that bring to pass in nature effects that do not proceed from nature. He proceeds:

You seem, dear sir, to think that such a doctrine is synonymous with Atheism. I earnestly protest. This doctrine excludes the capricious, thaumaturgic God who acts at intervals, commonly lets the clouds follow their course, but turns them aside for prayer; leaves a lung or viscera to decompose up to a certain point, but then arrests the decomposition on account of a vow; who changes his mind, in a word, from selfish views. Such a God, I admit, is anti-scientific. We do not believe in such a God, and should the saddest consequences ensue, the absolute sincerity which we profess would oblige us to say so.‡

Surely the casual reader who stumbles upon such evident contradictions as these, need not be very severely blamed if he accuses their author either of a want of clear and coherent views or of deliberate obscurity. The denial of Atheism is earnest and vigorous enough, but the ground for it is not clear. Can it be that Renan dreads the odium of Atheism? Does he fear that it may stand in the way of his preferment? In his discussion of the religious future of modern society, he had plainly declared that "Deism, which pretends to be scientific, is no more so than religion; it is an abstract mythology, but a mythology. It requires miracles; its God, interfering

* L'Athéisme Scientifique, p. 18. † Ditto, p. 19. ‡ Ibid, p. 19.

providentially in the course of the world, does not differ in reality from that of Joshua arresting the sun." But, pleads Sainte-Beuve, he has also said, "Humanity is of transcendental nature, *Quis deus incertum est, habitat deus.*"* Here we light again on the contradictions which are so dear to Renan. We are reminded that he believes contradiction, many-sidedness being the trait of all rich natures; these only find truth, for that dwells entirely in the shading or gradation of things. Here, too, we see upon what grounds his admirers claim that he is truly and profoundly religious. In all his works there is so much said about God, duty, humanity, immortality, the worship of truth, beauty, and goodness, that people naturally exclaim, This man must be religious! We do not question that conclusion; but we insist on knowing in what sense religion is possible to a man who holds this language on God, Providence, Miracles, and Immortality. So far as a thorough examination of his writings can justify such a statement, we are entitled to say that there is only one passage in them all that can furnish the true guiding clew in this most perplexing confusion. It occurs in Renan's critique on Feuerbach. The new Hegelian school in philosophy, as is well known, is purely and avowedly atheistic. Now Feuerbach is the ablest representative of that pitiless tribe of thinkers. Renan sets forth that they teach that Theism, Natural Religion, in short, every system which admits any thing transcendental, should be classed with Supernaturalism. Belief in God or human immortality is as superstitious as belief in the Trinity or miracles. Any thought of another world, any glance of man beyond himself, beyond reality, all religious emotion, clothed in whatever form, is mere delusion. Renan comments as follows:

> Not to be severe toward such a philosophy, we must look upon it as a misunderstanding. Influenced by the bad examples that prevail in German universities, the Teutonic thinker often plumes himself on an Atheism which is not real. When a German boasts his impiety, he must never be taken at his word. The Teuton is not capable of being irreligious; religion, that is, aspiration toward the ideal world, is the basis of his nature. Even his Atheism is devout and unctuous.

Then Renan speaks of his own views. For once he lays bare his inmost soul to our eyes. He is about to tell us the true truth, his uttermost thought, on these high matters:

* See Sainte-Beuve's articles on Renan.

Should any one, from the stand-point of substance, ask me, Does this God exist or not? I would reply, "O! God! He exists; all else but seems to exist." Then, as usual, he refines a little, appears to admit that for philosophers some other word would be better than God; but as the word God is in possession of the respect of mankind, and especially as priceless poetic associations are connected with it, he advises its retention. "Tell the simple to live in aspiration for truth, beauty, and moral goodness, they would find no meaning in your words. But bid them love God, not to offend God, they will understand you to a marvel. God, Providence and Immortality, old words all and a trifle heavy, perhaps, which philosophy will constantly interpret in a more refined way, but which she can never replace with advantage. Under one form or another, God will always be the summary of our supersensual needs, the form under which we conceive the ideal, as time and space are forms under which we conceive bodies. In other terms, man, in the presence of the beautiful, the true, and the good, escapes himself, and, in suspense under a celestial charm, annihilates his petty personality, is inspired and absorbed. What is that, if not adoration?"

One might be excused from pretending to understand all this, and for doubting whether the author always had a clear meaning in his own mind in writing such pages; yet it yields the best light we have on Renan's ideas. To be sure, Sainte-Beuve asserted in 1862, when Renan needed a skillful friend, that he had since retracted, or rather retouched, this idea of God, and had become a real Theist. The plea of the distinguished critic in favor of his nebulous friend is a masterpiece in its dexterity of insinuation, and its adroitness in imposing a conclusion without showing cause. But then, in the Life of Jesus and in the Apostles, since published, Renan asserts the rejection of the supernatural afresh on the same ground of experience. Now, the experience that can find no creation, no miraculous establishment of Christianity by an immediate divine act, how shall it find God? We have seen that it cannot. Moreover, Renan has taken pains to refute the ingenious sophistry of his friend. There has been, he tells M. Guéroult, no scientific attestation of the existence of any being superior to man, who interferes with the usual course of things. "*When he reveals himself, we will believe in him.*" Such a retouching of his first utterance may well close the lips of the apologist. Had Renan found any thing in the natural world for whose production natural laws were insufficient, any thing in human history that man could not bring forth, he might look

about him for a God. Do not ask him whence matter came? Who gave it its marvelous laws? How life first appeared on the globe? He has a vanished eternity, into whose awful and mysterious depths he can flee, planetary conditions which have long ago expired, wherein his fancy may have free play; and other planets where even now these miracles may be transpiring in an orderly development under constant natural laws. Here the essential thing is not to explain every thing, but to gain the conviction that with greater light every thing might be explained. He is sure that thinking beings must be the sons of these laws of nature; and yet he confesses that "to try to explain the appearance of man on earth by the laws that rule the phenomena of our globe since nature has ceased to create, would be opening the door to such extravagant fancies that no serious mind would pause there a moment."* He also asserts that "it is indubitable that man on a given day, by the natural and spontaneous expansion of his faculties, improvised language."† Here, again, we cannot conceive how this invention was effected. It should be remembered, likewise, that these statements are presented by a man who tells us that experience shows no God, not as fanciful conjectures, but as acquired scientific results. *Risum teneatis, amici?* Monotheism is easily explained on the biblical theory of a supernatural revelation. But since Renan holds that all theologies have sprung from the mind of man, his task in explaining it is more difficult. He admits that India, which has shown such originality, rich variety, and depth in her thinking, has not yet reached this truth, and that Greece, with all her intellectual vigor, would never have brought the world to it but for the aid of the Semitic nations. How did these people, whose range of mind is so much narrower than that of those races which have accepted Monotheism from their lips, first attain this high conception? For once Renan does not say *I know*, but *I think;* and his thoughts are feeble and contradictory. In opposition to his statement that Greece and India, with their amazing philosophical developments, never reached this notion, he affirms that, at a certain stage of its progress, the human mind becomes necessarily monotheistic. But here the contradiction grows flagrant; Greece, Rome, and India, then, should long ago have reached that stage of devel-

* Études d'Histoire Religieuse, p. 217. † Ibid., p. 217.

opment, and, much earlier than Judea and Arabia, have necessarily accepted Monotheism. The theorist feels this, and he contradicts himself afresh by telling us that there are monotheistic as well as polytheistic races.* Yet, according to his previous remark, no race is strictly monotheistic or polytheistic; all men should be polytheistic up to a certain stage of intellectual progress and then and there become monotheistic. But certain tribes became monotheistic long before they had reached the required limit, and others long ago passed it without giving up Polytheism. It was a Frenchman who said that a fact is brutal. Alas! had poor, dumb, wronged facts a voice, what might not they say of philosophers! The Semitic nations are naturally monotheistic, pursues Renan, and they reached the notion of One and the Supreme Deity without an effort in their earliest days, and by an immediate intuition. If that were true, it would impose on us a very singular and difficult problem, namely, How could a nation or race exceed all other civilized nations and races in its philosophy on this important topic and yet remain so infinitely behind the rest in all other branches of speculation? An intuition so profound in one matter and so shallow in all others would be a true miracle. This difficulty must be evaded, and so we are told that the desert is monotheistic, and that it whispered the sublime secret to its sons. Here, then, are three explanations of Monotheism: intellectual progress in all men issuing of necessity in that conclusion; monotheistic races who reach that truth by intuition; and the monotheistic desert which will have no Polytheism on its bosom. You may accept any of these that best flatters your preferences. Thus our author lavishes contradiction upon contradiction in his fruitless effort to escape the supernatural issue from the difficulty: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord." These shifts and evasions follow necessarily from existing facts, if the supernatural be cast aside. Whether they disclose the wisdom of that proceeding is not so clear. As we see Renan struggling with all these problems, we admire his courage, and are reminded of Megara's words about Hercules:

"Inveniet viam
Aut faciet."

---

* Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse, p. 66.

Art. II. — ON THE POWER OF MIND OVER NATURE.

Man and Nature; or, Physical Geography as Modified by Human Action. By Geo. P. Marsh. New York: Charles Scribner. 1865.

Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the One System of God. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner. 1858.

Principles of Geology. By Sir Charles Lyell. New York: Appleton & Co. 1857.

Reign of Law. By the Duke of Argyll. London: Alexander Strahan. 1867.

Essays. Philosophical and Theological. By James Martineau. Boston: Wm. V. Spencer. 1866. ("Nature and God.")

"A GREAT work might be written on the connection between the revolutions of nature and those of mankind: how they act each upon the other; how man is affected by climate, and how climate is again altered by the labor of man; how diseases are generated; how different states of society are exposed to different disorders; how, as all earthly things are exhaustible, the increased command over nature given by increased intelligence, seems to have a tendency to shorten the period of the existing creation by calling at once into action those resources of the earth which else might have supplied the wants of centuries to come; how, in short, nature, no less than human society, contains tokens that it had a beginning, and will surely have its end." *

The above passage from Dr. Arnold's "History of Rome" is one of those suggestive utterances occasionally met in the writings of great men, which are fruitful of many thoughts — one of those passages which give a mighty impulse to our own minds, and laying down the book, we start a voyage on our own account. We remember former thoughts which have flashed across our minds that were, somehow, strikingly akin to those which are now suggested. We recall numerous facts which have come under our observation, or have been observed and recorded by others, which crystallize around this one grand idea. We proceed to draw new inferences therefrom, and we catch glimpses of some higher principle, some more general law, which underlies the whole. And now, if we are ardent students, we shall reduce our facts and inductions to some methodical arrangement, and write them down.

* Thos. Arnold, D. D. "History of Rome," p. 190.

In some such way this passage from Arnold affected our own mind, and led us to reflect on the power of mind over material nature. We now present some of our thoughts to the readers of the *Quarterly Review*, in the hope they may stimulate further investigation and study in this interesting field.

It is of the utmost importance in all inquiries, especially so in this, that we are precise and exact in the use of terms. If we remember rightly, it is said by Coleridge that in the Arabic language there are a thousand names for the Lion. This, to say the least of it, must be a serious inconvenience. But it would have been worse than inconvenient if the Arabic for "Lion" had also a thousand other meanings. No one can imagine the misconception and confusion which must have arisen from the use of a word which might have been understood or misunderstood a thousand ways.

We are, however, in well-nigh such a predicament in regard to our English word "*Nature*" and its derivatives. To be sure, it has not a thousand meanings; yet there is not a more indefinite word in use among the English-speaking nations. Men talk fluently about "the laws of nature," "the order of nature," "the uniformity of nature," and sometimes of "eternal nature," without any settled and definite idea of the import of such expressions. At one time the term "nature" is used to denote the essential qualities of a thing, which constitute it what it is, as "the nature of light, heat, electricity," etc. At another time, as denoting that by which the qualities or constitution of a thing or being are determined, we say "nature has *done* this or that;" "nature has *given* this man rare endowments, or left that man strangely deficient!" In the writings of some, nature comprehends the sum of all phenomena—the universe of created beings—the earth with all its furniture, its plants and animals, and tribes of men; the sun and planets, the double stars, and remotest nebulæ. In the language of others, it means something underlying all phenomena—an impersonal power or agent which is the informing soul of the universe, and cause of all its movement and change. Sometimes it is used to designate *material* existence as contradistinguished from *mind;* at other times, as embracing both. In one book it stands for created, dependent existence; in another, it includes

the creating cause. One philosopher tells us it is "the empire of mechanical necessity;" another, that it is a system of things subject to the action of free powers, and permitting fortuities and contingencies. "The laws of nature" are now spoken of as *rules imposed upon nature* by an intelligence above nature; and then, as rules imposed by a mysterious, unconscious power upon the universe of being. Thus, by turns, nature is ideal and real; is lawgiver and subject; is effect and cause; is creature and creator.

It is surely high time we should seek to attain greater precision in the use of language. We shall never master a true philosophy until we come to use the terms "nature" and "natural" in a strict and definite sense.

The German philosophers and theologians, it is generally conceded, are more exact than ourselves in the use of language, and they employ the term "nature" in a very precise and uniform sense. "In the philosophy of Germany, '*natur*,' and its correlatives, whether of Greek or Latin origin, are, in general, used to express the *world of matter* in contrast to the world of mind." * If otherwise used, it is only in a tropical or accommodated sense.† This fixed and definite use of the term "nature" was first imported, and rendered current in English literature by S. T. Coleridge. In his "Aids to Reflection" we have a note on page 152 to this effect:

> Whatever is comprised in the chain and mechanism of cause and effect, of course necessitated, and having its necessity in some other thing, antecedent or concurrent—this is said to be natural; and the aggregate and system of all such things is *nature*. It is,

* Hamilton's "Metaphysics," p. 40, vol. i, Eng. ed.

† One or two examples of this consensus and use of the German writers may not be inappropriate. Here, then, are the words of Ullman: "This one world-order unfolds itself in different spheres, first as an order of nature in which *force* reigns; second, as an order of moral life, where *freedom* reigns. . . . In the domain of *nature*, every thing that takes place is accomplished by a *necessity* in the things themselves. . . . A law of nature is the operation of *mechanical* necessity."—"Sinlessness of Jesus," p. 24. Of the same import are the words of the profound Jacobi: "Nature reveals only an indissoluble chain of causes and effects. . . . To be in the middle of an [apparently] endless series is the characteristic of a *thing of nature*. . . . Man by his intelligence rises *above nature*, and is conscious of himself as a power independent of nature."—Von den Göttlichen Dingen, Werke, III, pp. 424–426. See Sir W. Hamilton's "Metaphysics," vol. i, pp. 40, 41, Eng. ed.

therefore, a contradiction in terms to include in this the free-will, of which the verbal definition is—that which originates an act, or state, or being.— *Works*, vol. i.

And again, at page 263 :

I have attempted, then, to fix the proper meaning of the words nature and spirit, the one being the antithesis to the other : so that the most general and negative definition of nature is, whatever is not spirit ; and *vice versa* of spirit, that which is not comprehended in nature ; or, in the language of our elder divines, that which transcends nature. But nature is the term in which we comprehend all things which are representable in the forms of time and space, and subject to the relations of cause and effect ; and the cause of the existence of which, therefore, is to be sought for perpetually in something antecedent. The word itself expresses this in the strongest manner possible : *natura*, that which is about to be born, that which is always becoming.— *Works*, vol. i.

The suffrages of the most exact thinkers and the best philosophers, in England and America, are in favor of this rigidly exact definition, and in this sense alone it is now used by our best writers. The chief excellence of Sir W. Hamilton, as a writer, is the accuracy with which he expresses the sharpest distinctions of idea in the most adequate and definite phraseology ; and with him "the empire of nature is the empire of *mechanical* necessity." This is the sense in which it is used by Mansel, the editor and annotator of Hamilton's works.* And it is so employed by Bushnell,† Heurtley,‡ Martineau,§ Guizot,‖ and indeed the best writers of the day. Let this, then, be the sense in which we use the term "nature." Nature is the empire of mechanical necessity. It is the world of matter with its properties and laws, which laws simply express the relations of resemblance, co-existence, and succession. It is the system of things in which we have only continuity and uniformity.

Now if this be nature, where shall we place *mind?* What shall we say of a *spiritual* essence or entity? What shall we say of "the spirit in man," of angelic spirits, of the Infinite Spirit? Shall we place these *in* nature or *above* nature ; shall we say they are *natural*, or *supernatural?* The Pantheist

* "Aids to Faith," p. 35. † "Nature and Supernatural," p. 36.
‡ "Replies to Essays and Reviews," p. 136. § "Essays," p. 126.
‖ "L'Eglise et la Société Chretienne en 1861," ch. iv.

will, of course, include all these in his "idea of nature." Nature is God, and God is nature. For him, therefore, there is nothing *super*natural. The majority of our readers will readily grant that the Infinite Spirit is supernatural. Angels are commonly regarded as supernatural beings. But when it is suggested that "the spirit in man" is a supernatural existence some are startled and surprised. Why startled and surprised? Surely it must be because they are imposed upon by venerable forms of speech, and misled by ancient prepossessions and prejudices. Do we not teach that the mind of man is not material, and not governed by the laws to which matter is subject? Mind is an active power, and not a passive thing. It does not stand in the chain of cause and effect.* It has spontaneity. It is self-moved. It can originate its own states and acts. It is essentially *free*. And if nature be the empire of mechanical necessity, we cannot say of such a free power that it is a part of nature. It is something above nature. It is capable of acting upon nature, of resisting, controlling, and conquering nature. And there is no other word which can express its relation to nature but the word *supernatural*.

There are only two conceivable grounds upon which a supernatural character and essence can be denied to mind. The first is that of materialism, the second is that of philosophical necessity.

It is beyond our present design to discuss the hypothesis of materialism. If, however, we are successful in the attempt to show that mind does control and subjugate nature, and produce results which nature, by her own unaided operations, never has produced, and never can produce, we shall establish a strong presumption that the mind of man is not material. The antagonism between the propositions above presented and the

* When I speak of laws, and of their absolute *necessity* in relation to thought, you must not suppose that these laws are the same in the world of mind as in the world of matter. For free intelligences, a law is an ideal necessity given in the form of a precept which we *ought* to follow, but which we may also violate if we please; whereas, for the existences which constitute the universe of nature, a law is only another name for the causes which operate blindly and universally in producing certain inevitable results. By a *law of thought* or *logical necessity* we do not, however, mean a physical law, such as a law of gravitation, but a general precept which we are able certainly to violate, but which if we do not obey, our whole process of thinking is suicidal, or absolutely null.—*Hamilton's Logic*, p. 56

doctrine of philosophic necessity was fully apprehended by Dr. Chalmers. He says: "Coleridge (who derived his views from the Germans) would certainly take from this doctrine its firmest support, if he could make good the affirmation that the events called volitions, or determinations of the will, are marked by this singularity, that they do not, like other events that we know of, lie within the category of cause and effect."*

* The author of the "Reign of Law" displays great confusion of thought in his chapter on "the Supernatural." He represents the theological conception of "supernatural power" as "power independent of the use of means," and then endeavors to show that, even in creation, we have not an example of the exercise of power independent of the use of means. "There is nothing in religion incompatible with the belief that all the exercises of God's power, whether ordinary or extraordinary, are effected through the instrumentality of means—that is to say, by *the instrumentality of natural laws*, brought out, as it were, and used for a divine purpose." P. 22. Of any divine power exercised prior to nature, or above natural law, he knows nothing. In this sense of the term, there is no such thing as "supernatural power."

Is there, then, any thing supernatural—that is, anything *super*, above or beyond, nature? any thing besides the uniformity of natural law? It is to be regretted that the writer has not favored us with a specific definition of the word "supernatural." Incidentally he has told us that the supernatural is the *superhuman* and *supermaterial*. P. 29. Here, again, the writer is involved in confusion. He quotes approvingly the words of Mansel, "The *superhuman is the miraculous*," that is, "it is the exercise of a power which transcends the limits of man's will." P. 17. A thunder-storm, then, is a miracle, because it is brought about by means which are beyond human reach! Was there, then, no radical difference between the resurrection of Lazarus and the ordinary phenomena of nature? Was Lazarus raised from the dead "by the use of means," as a thunder-storm is produced by the use of means? If so, then a miracle is not a *super*natural event, it is simply a natural occurrence.

The doctrine of the author seems to be, that "any special exertion of divine power for special purposes" comes within the "domain of nature." P. 18. The "supernatural" is, therefore, inclosed within "nature;" more correctly, there is nothing supernatural; the *super* is superfluous. The supreme will is subject to natural law. The universal reign of a fixed and changeless order circumscribes the action of the Divine Omnipotence. All the operations of God in nature, in history, in religion, are natural. "No glimpse is ever given to us of any thing but freedom within the bounds of law. The will revealed to us in religion is not—any more than the will revealed to us in nature—a capricious will, [who ever said it was a capricious will?] but one with which, in this respect, 'there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.'" P. 18. The reign of law is universal in the realm of mind as well as in the realm of matter, and nothing, however wonderful, which happens according to natural law will be considered by any one as supernatural." P. 5. The supernatural is cast out by the idea of natural law.

The vice of our author's system reveals itself more fully when he comes to treat of "the Reign of Law in the realm of Mind." "Here, too, there is a chain of

A 706202

—*Institutes*, vol. ii, p. 293. Now, to our mind, the freedom of the will does not need any proof. It is settled by a simple dictum of consciousness. That faculty which certifies my existence assures me that I am free. And the attempt to *prove* that I am free, is only equaled in absurdity by the attempt of Descartes to prove "I exist." If, then, the testimony of consciousness is to be relied upon, its deliverances are direct, emphatic, and conclusive—*the will is free!* The central point of consciousness—that which makes each man what he is as distinguished from *nature*—that which constitutes *personality*—that which expresses the real, indivisible essence of the mind, apart from all regulative laws and formal processes—is the power of self-determination and voluntary choice. If this freedom and spontaneity be withdrawn, our existence sinks down into a mere link in the chain of cause and effect, by which the operations of nature are carried forward. Without *will*, man would flow back from the elevation which he now assumes to the level of mere nature; in a word, he would cease to be a *power*, and become a *thing*. Spontaneity, will, personality, self-hood, or similar words, express, as nearly as possible, the essence of the human mind, and this is certainly something above nature.* "Man," says Jacobi, "by his intelligence rises above nature, and is conscious of himself as a power, not only independent of, but opposed to, nature, and capable of controlling, modifying, and governing nature." —*Von den Gottlichen Dingen*, Werke, volume iii, pp. 426, 427.†

In the language of a sound philosophy "*nature*" will henceforth stand for matter, with its properties, phenomena, and laws; and the "*supernatural*" will stand for spirit, with its

cause and effect running throughout all events." P. 295. There is the same order, the same uniformity, and consequently the same necessity as in the phenomena of matter. "If all antecedents to the volition were fully known, the volition itself could be predicted." So that, as Dr. Whedon has shown, (Meth. Quart., Jan., 1869, p. 151,) the Duke of Argyll is a "strict necessitarian."

Clearly, there is no alternative; if the will is not above nature—that is, supernatural—there is no supernatural power in the universe; and if creation is not a volitional act, there is no personal God.

* See Morell's "Philosophy of Religion," p. 3. Cousin's "History of Philosophy," vol. i, p. 16.

† Hamilton's "Metaphysics," vol. i, p. 41.

reason, its intelligence, its energy, its freedom, which first ordained the laws of matter, and still controls, uses, and subordinates these laws to its higher purposes and nobler ends.

Man, then, is above nature because there is an essence, an entity, in him which is supernatural. His will is a power which can act upon the chain of cause and effect in nature. He can control and direct the forces of nature. He can so collocate and adjust the properties and forces of nature as to accomplish ends which he designs, and bring about *new* results which nature, by her own internal working, could never have produced. If these propositions are established, then all objections to the revealed doctrine of a *Providence*, and of the direct interpositions of God in a *supernatural* way to instruct and save man, are rendered innoxious, and deprived of all force.

We shall present our proofs and illustrations in the following order:

I. The power of man in modifying the physical geography of the globe.

II. The influence of mind on the physiognomy of the earth.

III. The influence of mind on the physique of man.

IV. The power of mind to control and subordinate the mechanical, chemical, and electrical forces in nature.

V. The influence of mind on the vegetable life of the globe.

VI. The power of man over the instincts, habits, and development of the animal creation.

I. The power of man in modifying the physical geography of the globe.

Physical Geography deals: 1st, With the general features of the earth's surface—its mountains and rivers, its continents and seas; 2d, The atmosphere which surrounds it—its winds, rains, and climate; 3d, With the distribution of its vegetables and animal life—its zoological and botanical regions.

Now that man, by his intelligent action, has exerted a very great influence in modifying the climate of a country, and materially extending or materially circumscribing the geographical boundaries of a great number of plants and animals,

has been fully proved by Lyell, and still more amply shown by Marsh.

There can be no doubt that the increase and diminution of vegetation has a large influence on the climate of a country. The gradual spreading of forests will increase the humidity of the atmosphere. The felling of timber will materially diminish it. "In tropical countries, especially where the quantity of aqueous vapor in the atmosphere is great, and, at the same time, the direct rays of the sun are most powerful, the trees are an impediment to a free circulation of air, and screen the earth from the solar rays—they are thus a source of humidity; and where dampness and cold have begun to be generated by such causes, the condensation of vapor continues. Accordingly the cutting down of forests has been attended in many countries by the diminution of rain, as in Barbadoes and Jamaica."* It is also affirmed that in olden times, when France and England were covered with timber, Europe was much colder than at present. The winters in Italy were much colder than they are now. The Seine and many other rivers were frozen over every winter, and, in the fifteenth century, the Thames was commonly frozen so thick that the inhabitants could cross over in wagons from London to Southwark, and fairs were held regularly upon the ice. The clearing of the forests, by raising the temperature, and increasing the dryness of the air, reacts upon the climate.† In Palestine and many other parts of Asia and Northern Africa, which in ancient times were the granaries of Europe, fertile and populous, the most disastrous consequences have resulted from the destruction of the forests. "These lands are now deserts, and it is the destruction of the forests alone which has produced the desolation."

On the other hand, examples are not wanting of the beneficial influence of planting and restoring the woods. "In Scotland, where many miles square have been planted with trees, this effect has been evident, and similar observations have been made in several parts of Southern France. In Lower Egypt, both at Cairo and Alexandria, rain rarely fell in considerable quantities. For example, during the French occupation of Egypt, about 1798, it did not rain for sixteen months; but since

* Lyell's "Principles of Geology," p. 713.

† See Marsh's "Man and Nature," pp. 160, 161.

Mehemet Ali and Ibrahim Pacha executed their vast plantations, (the former alone having planted more than twenty millions of olive and fig trees, cottonwood, oranges, acacias, planes, etc.,) there now falls a good deal of rain, especially along the coast, in the months of November, December, and January; and even at Cairo it rains both oftener and more abundantly, so that real showers are no rarity." *

The application of human skill and labor in the draining of lakes and marshes, the reclamation of waste lands, and the cultivation of the soil, has exerted an appreciable influence upon the climate. Intermittent fevers have disappeared from England, chiefly, no doubt, in consequence of the careful drainage and high cultivation of the land. Two centuries ago they were as prevalent in England as they are now in the western States of America. Cromwell, Milton, and Bunyan died of intermittent fever. Fever and ague lingered in the fens of Lincolnshire until the commencement of this century. But the fens have been perfectly drained at the public expense, and that type of disease is now unknown in England.

The influence which man has exerted in extending or in contracting the geographical boundaries of plants and animals is still more marked and decided. It is known to our readers that there are distinct and well-defined botanical provinces and zoological regions which are the proper home and habitat of distinct species. These limits have been circumscribed, overleaped, and greatly modified by man. The stag, the wild horse, the boar, the bear, and the beaver have been exterminated in England. The eagle, the larger hawks, and the ravens have disappeared. The bustard, the bittern, the mallard, and the snipe, once so numerous, are now rarely seen. So the buffalo has become extinct in the Eastern and Middle States, and the deer is rapidly disappearing from all our forests.

While man has been circumscribing the limits and is threatening to extirpate many species of plants and of animals, he has been rapidly diffusing others over a wider area. He transports with him into every region the vegetables he cultivates for his food, and the animals he employs for his convenience. "The species of plants and animals originally inhabiting the eastern and western hemispheres were probably almost entirely differ-

* Marsh's "Man and Nature," p. 189.

ent, until the agency of man changed their geographical distribution; and almost the same may be said of the species north and south of the equator."* There is no question that wheat and the coffee-plant are indigenous to the Old World, and that the potato and the maize had their origin in the New. But they have been interchanged by man, and carried over the globe. Wheat is now cultivated in Europe, in North and South America, in New Zealand, Australia, and at the Cape of Good Hope. The potato is cultivated in almost every land. Coffee is largely grown in both hemispheres, and maize is cultivated in abundance both in the North and the South.

The most striking illustration of the influence of man in the distribution and naturalization of species of plants and animals is found in the fact that, in Australia, New Zealand, Southern Africa, and North America, the aboriginal European species of plants exceed in number all those which have come from all other regions, just because the Anglo-Saxon race has carried them along in its migrations. When Australia was first discovered, the land quadrupeds belonged exclusively to the marsupials—as the kangaroo, wombat, and flying opossom, and the native fruits and vegetables were not adequate to sustain human life.† But man has introduced the sheep, the alpaca, the horse and oxen; the latter have become so numerous as to fill some of the forests with wild cattle. Now wheat, barley, oats, Indian-corn, are extensively cultivated. The apple, the pear, the plum, and the peach have been naturalized, and culinary vegetables are abundant.

The extraordinary herds of wild cattle and horses which overrun the plains of South America are descendants from a few pairs carried there by the Spaniards. And in the Islands of the Pacific, were once there were no quadrupeds and no domestic fowls, hogs are now wild in their forests, and domestic fowls are abundant. The first pairs were left on the Islands by Captain Cook in 1772.

Thus changes of great magnitude and of great importance in the physical geography of the globe have been effected by man. The intelligence, the spiritual energy that is in man, has prompted him to attempt, and persevere through a long succession of ages in the attempt, to secure the conquest of

* Dr. Carpenter's "Comparative Physiology," p. 624. † Ibid., p. 623.

nature. While the lower animals are every where the unresisting slaves of nature, the mere sport of their destiny, or of the lot which external conditions impose upon them, without making any efforts to modify the circumstances around them, man, on the contrary, gains victories over nature. Hence it is that he is a cosmopolitan. While among the wild animals of the forest each species can exist only on a comparatively small portion of the earth's surface, man is capable of living in every clime, of modifying the circumstances around him, and carrying along with him over their natural geographical boundaries those plants and animals which are needful for his convenience or his food.*

II. The influence of mind on the physiognomy of the earth.

We are here employing the term "physiognomy" in a special sense, to denote the aspect which the earth presents at any spot within the ordinary range of vision, as distinct from the more comprehensive vision of science.

The earth, like the human countenance, has an expression. There is upon it the wild and untamed luxuriance of nature, or the softness and elegance of culture. Now its countenance is gloomy, savage, terrific. Now it is mild, ethereal, lovely. This face and aspect of nature has been wonderfully changed by the skill and art of man. Her features have been softened and molded by cultivation. The lineaments of her countenance have been altered by the hand and device of man.

Imagine the aspect which Great Britain presented to the eye of the Roman invader, as contrasted with the face it now presents to the eye of the modern traveler. True, the general contour, the outlines of the coast, and the lines of mountain ranges, are the same as they were two thousand years ago; but the physiognomy of the country is so changed that, were Julius Cæsar to return, he could not recognize one foot of the territory of ancient Albion. England was then covered with dense primeval forests, in which painted savages followed the chase. There were no houses, no roads, no cultivated fields, no populous cities. Her shores were, to the polished Romans, the object of mysterious dread, like that with which the Ionians, in the

* See "Agassiz and Gould's Zoology," p. 133.

age of Homer, regarded the Straits of Scylla, and the homes of the Læstrygonian cannibals. There was one province of the island where, Procopius had been told, the ground was covered with serpents, and the air was so poisonous no one could breathe it and live.

Now Britain is one vast garden from shore to shore. The primitive forests, with their thick undergrowth and impassable swamps, are gone, and in their place we see the tastefully planted parks. The ancient commons are now divided, by living hawthorn hedges, into cultivated fields. The wild, dank grasses are displaced by flowing golden grain. The land is studded with villages and cities, the hives of industry and the marts of commerce. The rude druidical Stonehenge is superseded by the gorgeous cathedral. The worship of Tecanus and Belenus has disappeared, and been supplanted by the worship of the living God. The rivers are now alive with steamers, the harbors are crowded with sea-going vessels, and the land is covered with a network of highways and railroads from shore to shore. These are not the doings of nature. These are the works of intelligent man, who has subdued, and tamed, and cultivated, nature!

Let any one look around the grand State of Michigan, remembering how it looked forty years ago in "simple nature," and see how it looks to-day under the hand of man. These fields of flowing grain and stately corn; these orchards with richly-ladened fruit trees; these gardens blushing with the virgin rose, the lily, and the violet; these tasteful homes, are a *new* face put on old nature; a face which nature never would have worn if man, with his skill and industry, his taste and his love of the beautiful, had not been here.

"The primitive world," says Cousin, "is nothing more than material for the labor of man; and it is labor which has given to this matter the value which it possesses. The destiny of man (I mean in his relation with the world) is to assimilate nature as much as possible to himself, to plant in it, and in it make appear, unceasingly, the liberty and intelligence with which he is endowed. Industry, I repeat it with pleasure, is the triumph of man over nature, whose tendency was to encroach upon and destroy him, but which retreats before him, and is metamorphosed in his hands; this is truly nothing less

than the *creation of a new world by man.*" * The face of nature, then, is plastic to the hand of man. He can mold it in accordance with his ideas; he can modify it to subserve his own ends.

III. *The influence of mind on the physique of man.*

The power of the mind over the body is confessedly great. It employs the body as its instrument, and the instrument becomes at length transfused, and spiritualized by the intelligence and liberty which it has served. Even the senses, the avenues which open to the external world, are very much under the control of the will. Voluntary attention may render them more acute and exquisite, on the one hand, or the mind may withdraw itself, as it were, from sensation, on the other hand, altering the conditions, and modifying the action of the nervous centers. Look at Socrates when a soldier in the camp before Potidæa. Amid the severities of mid-winter, when the ice and snow were upon the ground, he stands barefoot and lightly clad for twenty-four hours on the same spot, wrapt in meditation and insensible to all things around him! Archimedes was so absorbed in a geometrical problem that he was indifferent to the storming of Syracuse, and was first made aware of the fact when he received his death-wound. Newton, while engaged in his mathematical researches, often forgot to dine; and on one occasion sat on the edge of his bed a whole day, with one foot in his pantaloons, lost in profound meditation. Cadman was once, upon a journey, so lost in thought that he forgot both his way and his errand. He made no answer to the questions of his driver as to where he should go, and when he came to himself at nightfall, he was surprised on finding his carriage at a stand directly under a gallows.

Think of the power which the imagination exerts over the body! Why, it has cured more cases of sickness than drugs! The word Ananazipta, scrawled on parchment, has reduced the fever. Abracadabra, the name of a Syrian god, figured on an amulet, and worn around the neck, has cured the ague. An hexameter from the Iliad has allayed the agony of gout. The rheumatism has yielded to a verse of the Lamentations of Jeremiah. And the scrofula has fled at the touch of royalty.

* Lectures, vol. i, p. 17.

Wiseman, one of the fathers of surgery in England, says, in his remarks on scrofula, "that his Majesty Charles II. cured more people by his *touch*, in one year, than all the chirurgeons of London had done in an age." * During twelve years, *ninety-two thousand one hundred and seven persons* flocked to Whitehall and Windsor, mostly at the instance of the "regular physicians," and many of them were unquestionably cured. The same Wiseman affirms, "I myself have been a frequent eye-witness of many hundreds of cures performed by his Majesty alone." A visit to the tomb of the Abbé de Paris, or a sight of the "holy coat" at Treves, has enabled the lame to throw away their crutches and walk home. Perkins's "metallic tractors" cured every kind of disease. Their efficacy is vouched for by eight learned professors in four different universities, twenty-one regular physicians, nineteen surgeons, thirty clergymen, and five thousand other people. Dr. Haygarth's bits of painted wood, in imitation of the metallic tractors, did just as great wonders. So that, as Dr. Bostock affirms, "they had power to do every thing except to make a new limb grow when the old one had been amputated." And in modern times a *placebo*, say a "bread pill," when called "mercurial," has produced copious salivation, and when named an "anodyne," has given refreshing sleep. In the hands of Dr. Jennings, of Oberlin, it carried Professor Finney through a severe attack of typhoid fever, and cured little children of croup. I will not dare to say what wonders are being now performed by the millionth part of a grain of aconite. But here in America, in this nineteenth century, we have heard intelligent and reliable persons tell how they were cured of dyspepsia by swallowing "live angle-worms," and how others have been cured of epilepsy by the little triangular bones found in the head of the hog. We cannot for a moment doubt the reality of most of these cures. But instead of ascribing them to the various agencies above mentioned, we attribute them to the marvelous, almost miraculous, power of the mind upon the body of man.

Reflect, also, on the influence which the *mental emotions* exert on the body of man. How does fear blanch the cheek, and shame crimson it! How does courage nerve the arm, and panic cause the muscles to relax! Desire speaks through the

* See "Dunglison's Therapeutics," etc., p. 63.

eye, joy illuminates the countenance, hope wreaths the brow with an ideal crown, and manliness of soul reveals itself in every attitude and movement of the body. Powerful emotion often kills the body at a stroke. Chilo, Diagoras, and Sophocles died of joy at the Grecian games. The news of defeat killed Philip the Fifth. The doorkeeper of Congress expired on hearing of the surrender of Cornwallis. And Largrave, the young Parisian, died when he heard that the musical prize for which he had competed had been awarded to another.

And do not overlook the power of *ideas.* How they do take hold upon the whole man and exert a perfect mastery! We need only to be reminded of Loyola, Peter the Hermit, Joan of Arc, Christopher Columbus, Martin Luther, to see the power of an idea to inspire a man with almost superhuman energy, and inaugurate a new era in human history. Ideas are the forces which move the moral world.

Mind also exerts a great influence in fashioning and developing the outward man. Ignorance, superstition, and vice will, in a few generations, deform the body, give dullness and stupidity to the countenance, listlessness to the eye, increase the facial angle, and finally lessen the volume of brain.* Intelligence, mental culture, refinement of taste, will reverse all this. They will give dignity to a man's gait, luster to his eye, expression to his countenance, symmetry to his features, and in a few generations the facial angle will be changed to 80°, the volume of the brain will be increased, and a more beautiful race will be the result.† Whoever has had the opportunity of contrasting the physical development of the population of Van Dieman's Land with the people of America will be convinced of this. The great mental and moral differences are seen on the face and physique of the people. The Grecian beauty was no doubt the effect of Grecian mental culture; and the sternness of the Roman physiognomy resulted from their military employments, and their study of the law. From childhood to age the outer man is molded and fashioned by the soul; in some sense, the body is a creation of the mind.

* See Pritchard's "Races of Men," vol. ii, p. 349.

† "It appears to be conclusively proved that barbarism tends in a few generations to deteriorate the physical characters of even the highest races of mankind by increasing the facial angle, etc., while the reverse induces proportional physical improvements."—CUVIER'S "Animal Kingdom," p. 41.

Art. III.—HOLY SCRIPTURE A DIVINE REVELATION.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, BY J. F. HURST, D. D., OF BREMEN.

At the time of the Imperial Diet of Augsburg, 1530, when evangelical truth appeared to be in the most imminent danger, Luther wrote to his troubled friend, Chancellor Brück, as follows: "I have lately seen a miracle. As I looked out of the window at the stars and God's whole heavenly dome, I nowhere saw any pillars on which the Master had placed such a dome. But the heavens fell not, and the dome still stands fast. Now there are some who seek such pillars, and would like very much to feel and grasp them; but because they cannot do it, they tremble and writhe, as if the heavens would certainly fall for no other reason than that they do not see or grasp the pillars; if, however, they could only grasp them, the heavens would still stand secure."* The meaning of this vigorous allegory is clear enough—that all God's works, and even the truths of the Gospel, like the heavenly dome, need no visible support, but are established within themselves, and by their existence and indestructible duration bear within themselves their own proof.

It has been considered a vital task of the Church in these our days to write apologetical works, to establish apologetical periodicals, and to institute courses of apologetical sermons; and these efforts have been followed by good results. But though they all, together with the conclusions which we here present, may have the character of carrying on the defense of an important doctrine, yet it must not be understood that evangelical truth can first acquire stability and certitude by such defense, and, in general, by the palpable supports of human reason. It stands of itself. Never once has faith in these truths needed such props. Faith is rather, according to the exact translation of Heb. xi, 1, the self-supporting foundation of invisible things; as it is not the growth of reason but of the living experience of a new creation of the whole soul—that direction of our life to God which we could not take by our

* Compare the whole letter in Walch's Quarto Edition of Luther's Works, XVI, p. 2140f.

own knowledge or will—so can it be neither shaken nor proved by the arguments of reason.*

But when we speak of the necessity of defending Christianity it is important, first of all, to confirm for believers, on the ground of reason, those truths which have already become their vital forces; after this it is important to prove the untenable character of the ever-newly-presented assumption that Christianity is in irreconcilable conflict with the civilization of the age, and that it is absurd in these our days to affirm that the heavenly dome still stands. The civilization of the age is a certain sum of knowledge and intellectual facilities which have been promoted and made the common possession of the thinking minds in the nation by the progress of the sciences, by the improvement of the mental faculties, and by the enrichment of the mind which art has produced. But knowledge and facilities are in themselves neither believing nor unbelieving; they are the possessions of the intellect and memory, while faith is a fact of the soul. And it is therefore the task of apologetics to show that the civilization of our age, which has been employed by unbelievers as a weapon of attack, can just as well be used by believers as a weapon of defense; that as faith is not a merely knowing or thinking, but is born in that center of our personal life whose ground is the will, so also can unbelief (that is, not the contraction of single theological points, but of the whole doctrine of the Gospel) not conceal itself under any pretended necessity of thought, but comes entirely from the will. It must be granted that this perverted direction of the will is very wide spread among the cultivated minds of the present time. But to wish to conclude from this that unbelief is closely connected with the civilization of the age, would be just as absurd as to charge this civilization with the mania of spirit-rapping or secret medicinal remedies.

Simultaneously with the proof that the irreconcilable contradiction between faith and civilization is a matter of merely empty talk, it will also follow that there just as little exists the necessity, which has been deduced from it, of seeking to counteract this alleged hopeless loss of the age to Christianity by invoking the protection of an external human authority, such as the Romish Church presents.

* Comp. Twesten, "Vorlesungen über Dogmatik," vol. i, 3d ed., 1834, pp. 335ff.

From what we have said, those most likely to attend apologetical lectures are the men in the Church whose disposition to believe has been brought into perplexity by the assurance and scientific display of the modern attacks on Christianity. From this it follows that the method of the apologists must be to indicate, often briefly and inadvertently, those things which, with him who stands fast in faith, must have the force of main truths and real demonstrations; and, on the other hand, to treat with special care those points which are most exposed to the attacks of the present day, and to use the weapons which the civilization of the age presents.

If we now apply what we have said to our special theme—*that the entire contents of revealed, Christian, saving truth are laid down completely and with divine propriety in the forty-nine books of the Holy Scriptures*—it is clear from the start that, to one who believes, this theme in particular will require no proof whatever. For both a knowledge of the contents of the Scriptures, (Rom. x, 14,) and the acknowledgment that these contents are given by divine communication, that is, by revelation, are necessary assumptions of faith; this is so very much the case that we cannot conceive of faith without it. Therefore, even in the prosperous times of the Church this foundation of faith has been regarded so very certain in itself that, taking our German Reformers as an example, we nowhere find an elaborate proof of this proposition.* Likewise the earliest teachers of the Church, such as Irenæus and Origen, have said so little of this self-evident proposition that our acute Lessing could be led into the remarkable error of supposing that the Holy Scriptures had never been regarded as a rule of faith until after the Council of Nice.† Calvin teaches expressly that the self-proof which faith has of the divinity of the Holy Scriptures—the witness of the Holy Spirit in our hearts—is the only thing which has force; all other things are only additions and supplements to this.‡ And even such an impartial witness as Goethe corroborates the profound and far-reaching

* Comp. Marheinecke, System des Katholicismus, II, p. 224f. 1810.

† Comp. the Refutation of Lessing, in Sack, Nitzsch and Lücke, über das Ansehn der Heiligen Schrift, p. 121ff. Bonn, 1827.

‡ Compare Calvin, Institutio Religionis Christianæ, edit. Tholuck. T. I. P. 57ff. Berol, 1846. Also Schleiermacher, der christliche Glaube, I, p. 112. Berlin, 1821.

truth of the Scriptures by saying in his autobiography, with special reference to the Bible, that no criticism will be able to perplex the confidence which we have once entertained of a writing whose contents have stirred up and fructified our vital energy by its own.*

Faith, from this stand-point, will also not be at a loss to account more specially for the ground of this confidence. (1 Peter iii, 15.) It will say, "The Scriptures have for me a divine authority, because they have arisen by God's giving the thoughts to the sacred writers, and then causing them to write them down." And if faith be questioned as to the ground of its support of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, it will simply refer to the declarations contained in them. It will say, "I see in the prophets, the historians, and the poets of the Old Testament, and in the apostles and evangelists of the New, the purest will to say just what they feel; I see in them also a reverent submission to the truth which they proclaim, as if they had not received it from themselves, but from some One to whom they voluntarily subjected themselves. I nowhere see in them a disposition to exaggerate, and slavishly submit to, conscience by self-fabricated words. I see that they are chiefly simple-hearted and lowly-born men, whose sense of truth was not decomposed and dissolved by any false culture, or by any exercise in rhetorical, sophistical, and dialectic arts. I see in them, finally, a mighty and utterly unselfish desire of their spirit to help the men for whom they speak to the salvation of their souls. Comp. 1 Cor. vii, 35. And when these men—whom I must call holy men, because of such a pure effort, (2 Peter i, 21,) and for whose words and writing of them I can find no earthly motive, for they were confronted only by pain of heart at contempt, (Isa. liii, 1,) the hate of the multitude, (John xvii, 14,) and martyrdom,† (Luke xi, 50)—when these men say that the Scriptures are inspired by the Holy Spirit, (2 Tim. iii, 16;‡ 1 Peter i, 10ff.;) when it is to them a solemn doctrine, (Deut. xxx, 11ff,) that God's word does not come like the oracular voices of the heathen from the air, nor

* Werke, XXII, P. 75f. Stuttgart, 1840.

† Comp. Menken, Versuch einer Anleitung, zum eigenen Unterricht in der Heiligen Schrift, 3d ed., p. 21ff. Bremen, 1833.

‡ Comp. Van Oosterzee, in Lange's Commentary on the Bible, in loco.

like the inspiration of the Pythian Apollo from the earth, and must be brought from far beyond the sea, but that it is produced in the heart and mouth of man; when the prophets always precede their statements by 'Thus saith the Lord,' and the apostles asseverate that they do not speak from human wisdom but by God's power, (1 Cor. ii, 4f,) I would call it blasphemy to stand out against all this with a hostile or doubting heart. I would do this all the more because the best witness of an inward event is he who has experienced it; and when I read the writings of the sacred authors I experience in my soul a confirmation which does not come from myself, that the same Holy Spirit which draws me to God must have produced these words: 'It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.' 1 John v, 6."

To the believer this proof from the declarations of the Scriptures will be sufficient of itself. But if we turn toward unbelief and the vacillations of faith, and therefore against the will whose peculiar power has become diseased, or even dead, and which cannot feel that immediate impression of the Scriptures any more, we will be met by this objection: "You are arguing in a circle by wishing to prove that the Scriptures are given by God, and then taking your proof from the Scriptures." This objection is sophistical, as will be plain on closer examination; for, in proofs from the declarations of Scripture, we have not yet appealed to the declarations of the Holy Spirit as such, but only to the words of credible men. But yet we would be satisfied if we succeed in determining the stand-point of faith, because unbelief, from its very nature, has no susceptibility of this demonstrative force; and in order to meet this objection on its own field, we would first of all proceed to answer the question as to what is the most general cause which leads men to oppose the divine origin and authority of the Scriptures, or even believe that they can do without them.

The cause with most men is, that they believe that every one finds in his own consciousness, even without the Scriptures, all the religious and moral truths which the Scriptures contain. In the last century it was found that a large number of religious ideas, as, for example, those of God's love, love of our neighbor, and the creation of the world by God, were already present in the consciousness of every thinking man. And,

according to the manner of that century, these ideas were regarded just as innate as philosophy, right, etc., which were spoken of as innate. From this notion of an innate religion, men began to play the master of the Holy Scriptures, and declared, among other assumptions, that what the Scriptures contained which did not harmonize with their own ideas was only the prejudice of the sacred writers and their accommodation to their times. By this means it was natural that the doctrine of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures should be gradually reduced to a mere shadow, and it would appear that there was no need of the club-blows that Strauss has inflicted on this doctrine by his philosophical dogmatics in order to strike the shadow out of existence. If religion be innate, then there is naturally no need of a revelation, and therefore also of no inspiration. And that is now the stand-point of most of the opponents of the Gospel, who, indeed, would still be regarded religious.

But all that talk of an innate religion is an unhistorical fiction. Those religious ideas which are alleged to come into the world with man are not at all universally human, and therefore also not innate; but so far as they possess any inward truth, they are all derived from the Scriptures, and have only become so general just because the Scriptures have become a common possession of evangelized nations. If they were innate, then must their presence in the heathen world be proved; and if we grant that their reaching maturity in the rude nations would have been prevented by stupidity, they must at least be found among the Greeks and Romans, those heathen nations which, according to universal consent, have reached the highest intellectual culture in all other departments. But how does the case stand with them? Quite apart from the specifically Christian doctrine of redemption by the Son of God, which nobody has yet dared to ascribe to natural religion, it is one of the principal maxims of that religiousness which is alleged to come into the world with man, that all men are brethren. But Aristotle, the greatest philosopher of antiquity, at whose feet even to this day every one sits who would make attainments in the knowledge of nature, begins his doctrine of the State by laying down the principle that some men are born to be masters and some to be slaves. The principle of universal fraternity is unheard of outside the realm of the Holy Scriptures; as in the

same people the free men and the slaves separate, so does every unevangelized nation repudiate all others as barbarians.

But it is said that Plato has declared the great maxim that we should be like God; "and yet the maxim belongs to the innost essence of religion." Certainly; but after Plato, the man rich in presages, uttered that noble sentiment in a more contemplative than comprehensive manner, Aristotle again thrust it into the dust. He discovered the strange and supernatural character of the doctrine; he felt that Plato's mouth was here no more the organ of Grecian civilization, but of a strange deity, of Jehovah, who had cast these sparks of light to Athens from his temple beyond the Mediterranean Sea. And what shall we say when the heathen stoical philosophy, which men are accustomed to say contains the maxims of natural religion in their most perfect form, does not build its morals on humility, but on proud contempt; when it knows nothing of God's love, but only bows, though with the seeming laugh of the wise man, before a heartless fate whose will is cold and dark; when it praises suicide as the highest human privilege, as the greatest virtue; and when we seek in vain to find in it the doctrine of the Creator, and meet every-where merely a nature become such only through its own effort?* Thus it follows plainly that all the maxims —that humility is a virtue, the world a creation, suicide a sin, God is love, and all men are brethren—which have been seized upon for natural religion as innate truths, have never been practiced by the most highly gifted heathen, not to mention their having pervaded the heart of a heathen nation; that man cannot derive them from himself, but that they are the special possessions of the Holy Scriptures; and that, if they are found in the world, there must have been a revelation to communicate them, and this revelation lies before us in the Holy Scriptures. And in relation to the numerous parallels to Christian maxims which we find in the pre-Christian writers, that sentiment of Augustine is of force even to-day: "It is because we are Christians that we find Christ in those parallels; but if we were not Christians, all those harmonies would not produce a single trace

* Comp. Neander's Treatises on the Relations of Hellenic to Christian Ethics, in the Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben, by Schneider. No. 9f., 15f., 19ff. 1850.

of our religion in our hearts, and the most they would do would be to excite a desire for it."* "But," it is objected, that, "granted all these religious ideas have proceeded from the Holy Scriptures, we can dispense with them now, their contents having passed into our consciousness; and being in the possession of the water, we need no more trouble ourselves about the fountain." Or, to make use of Lessing's well-known turn: "God has placed in man's hand the key to his arithmetical problem by giving him revelation, and having now found out the solution, we do not need any more the key which he has given us. In this way all the differences of the Holy Scriptures would be removed in a trice." But even this objection is unhistorical. It can be very easily proved that the way which the human race has taken—in which our conscience has become pervaded by scriptural truths—has not been a graduated and uniform progress. In the third century, for example, men were nearer to the "key" than in the fifteenth. Indeed, no achievement of humanity independent of that key is once heard of; the religious knowledge of each generation of each period has been just as high as the Holy Scriptures were regarded; and when the Scriptures were discarded, and men began to labor independently in this department, religious decline immediately made its appearance. It is well known how great was the alienation of religious education from the Scriptures in the century preceding the Reformation; and the Reformation consisted essentially in again establishing the Scriptures in their own right and home. Our own times furnish the exact counterpart to this period. At the beginning of the present century, or even only thirty years ago, there was some show of right in speaking of a harmony of involuntary religiousness and scriptural truth; but by the alienation of the masses from the Scriptures, which has become the order of the day since then, the old heathen errors have taken the place of those religious truths. The denial of creation by God; the stupid submission to rigid fate, instead of humble submission to God's love; the hostile isolation of nationalities; the morals of proud contempt; the defense of slavery as a natural institution; and the vacillating opinion on suicide, have, for years, not any more been isolated phenomena, but characteristics of

* Comp. the Confessions, C. VII, c. 20ff.

a very great circle in all departments of society, which would still be styled "Christian." We can conceive of no stronger proof than that the Holy Scriptures were not merely necessary to bring religion into the world, but are also necessary to support it. And so has every new advance in the development of religious knowledge been merely a new attachment to the Scriptures, and an explanation of new features of the Scriptures; and the Scriptures themselves stand unapproached, indispensable, and unexhausted, above all doctrinal developments.* Even the most self-conscious Confession of our Church, the Formula Concordiæ, lays claim to no more than simply to express the knowledge of the meaning of the Scriptures which the theology of that day possessed. (*Introduc.*, § 8.) In the same way does a general survey of the history of Christian preaching show that all the real progress which it has made has only been when it strove to approach the Scriptures, and assimulate as much as possible with them. In a word, the religious labor of Christian humanity has neither been an arithmetical problem nor an independent calculation of religious truth; nor have we so fully appropriated the key given us in the Scriptures as to be able to do without them. But men have been in error in supposing that they have found of themselves the scriptural fragments remaining in their hearts. If we leave the Scriptures the fragments will also soon drop out of the heart.

But if it now be true that the human mind has neither discovered the contents of the Scriptures by its own strength nor is able to keep pure without them—that it recognizes the truths of Scripture as the most perfect in existence—that it finds them *above* reason, but yet so little *contrary* to reason that it could for a time indulge the illusion that its own reason had furnished them—the reflex conclusion will be established, that these truths can proceed only from One who at the same time pervades the depths of human reason, and soars omnipotently, purely, and infallibly above it. But only such a one is God; and, accordingly, not merely faith but also history compels us to trace the origin of the Holy Scriptures back to him, and to affirm their divine inspiration. But how must we regard this process of *inspiration?* It is, above all things, an operation of the Spirit;

* Comp. C. Perthes, Perthes Leben, III, p. 202ff. 1855.

not a mechanical but an inward influence of the Spirit of God on the spirit of man. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." It is not machines who have spoken, but holy men, persons whose holiness and moral and religious character, united with God, were the real condition of inspiration. This leads us to a prominent point, that the Scriptures, having become God's word, must be understood according to their counterpart, Christ—the Word become flesh—with whose personal appearance the Scriptures have come as the real foundation of God's kingdom in the world. As Christ is the God-man, so are the Scriptures also divinely human;* they have arisen from a co-operation of the Spirit of God, as leading and causing, with the human spirit as working out, so that those holy men placed all their natural intellectual power at the service of the divine labor to which they had committed themselves. In the early Church there prevailed for some time the doctrine that Christ did not have a human spirit, but that the reason of God took in him the place of human reason. This doctrine was rejected by the Church at the Council of Constantinople A. D. 381; for if Christ has not been perfect man, but merely externally so, then he was also not perfect God-man; divinity was united in him with the human spirit, and the human spirit had to be present with it, otherwise there would have been no organ with which it, which is spirit, could have united. The case stands just the same with the divine humanity of the Holy Scriptures. Here, too, the same doctrine has arisen from time to time, just as if the holy men had been nothing more than involuntary instruments, dead machines, the sorry pencils of the Holy Spirit; but the truth is, that just as Christ's life was a product of the divine and human spirit, so is also Scripture. And the way which the Holy Spirit has taken in inspiration is just the same that it has always taken—the way of salvation, purification, holiness. Error comes from sin. The same Holy Spirit which has converted the biblical writers from sinners to holy men—that is, to those who no more seek their power of life in sin but in God—has also made them from blind wanderers to those who see. Just as the Holy Spirit directed their will from darkness to God, so has it also

* Comp. Riehon, über den Gottmenschlichen Charakter der Heiligen Schrift, in the Studien und Kritiken, p. 304ff. 1858.

directed their knowledge;* and what they have written has been due to an impulse received in the will from this knowledge made one with God. What they could just as little have found as any heathen has found, by a natural reason charged with sin and error, has been given to them in this purification, elevation, and glorification of their natural thought and knowledge.

The character of the authorship of Scripture corresponds also with this twofold operation of the divine and human. There are, on the one hand, because God's Spirit operates, the all-pervading *divine worth* and *clear depth* of its method of expression.† We call those worldly writers classical in whom there is such a concentration to their subject that word and meaning completely cover each other, and not a word can be changed without injuring the sense. We need only call to mind Shakspeare and Goethe. Such classicalness is presented to us in the highest degree in the Holy Scriptures. Every-where we are impressed by the feeling that the language is not circumscribed by any limits of a low direction of the soul or defective interest in the theme. The expression is just what the impression was; it is unfettered, full of what has been beheld and experienced, and disposing freely on all sides. And we must also say that, in this sense, not merely the import but also the words of the Holy Scriptures are inspired. No man ever has a clear idea without having it at the same time in words, and for every idea there is only one perfect expression to cover it; this perfect expression of the divine thought is given in the Holy Scriptures, and God alone could give it.‡

The grand supernatural *truthfulness* of the historiography of the Bible also takes its origin from the operation of God. No people of ancient times presents a popular literature in which the sin and greatness, the guilt and merited judgments, and the shame and conquest of the nation, have been portrayed with such impartiality. It is only the popular literature of

* Comp. Oetinger, Theologie aus der Idee des Lebens, published by Hamberger, p. 93. 1852.

† Comp. Bungener, Rom und die Bibel, translated into German by Junger, p. 170ff. 1862.

‡ Hence the importance of textual criticism, in order to establish from different manuscripts the original language of the Holy Scriptures. Comp. Bengel's Literarische Briefwechsel, communicated by Burke, p. 77. Stuttgart. 1836.

Israel which the Holy Spirit has created in the Old Testament that stands above all human partiality.* It is here alone that the man of God stands before the great favorite and says, "Thou art the man!"

But, on the other hand, because the spirit of man is the living organ of operation, we see in the holy writers all the noble affections, powers, and efforts of *human nature.* We see, as Luther says, into the heart of God's saints;† we here find the right word, the right point of view, the right way of conquest, and the right consolation for every storm and for every temptation that beset us.‡ The Prophet, with an inflexible earnestness that will alleviate nothing of the truth, proclaims the divine judgment impending over his people in order to unite, in the same moment, with the stricken people in their sorrowful lamentation. Micah i, 2ff. 8.

Again, the arduous *industry and painstaking fidelity* of the historical writers of the Old and New Testaments testify to this introduction of the human into God's work.§ Luke, as he says at the beginning of his Gospel, makes known all things from the beginning that had been collected on the history of Jesus, (Luke i, 1–4,) and all the evangelists and prophets are so painstaking in their respect for what is communicated, has occurred, and has been heard, that they prefer to invite upon themselves the charge of an apparent contradiction, and leave to the shallow minds of subsequent centuries to make the supposed new discovery, rather than to take their own authority for changing a single word.

They also pass before us in the most varied *individualities:* in the Old Testament the law-givers, heroic kings, teachers of wisdom, preachers of repentance, and proclaimers of salvation; in the New Testament the scripturally learned Matthew, the sharply defining Mark, the broad-hearted Luke; John, in whose heart there arose the light of eternity even though he

* Comp. M. Niebuhr, Geschichte Assurs und Babels, p. 5. 1857. Also Pascal, Pensées, II, p. 70. Berlin, 1836.

† Comp. Luther's Preface to the Psalter, frequently printed, for example, in Kurtz's Literaturgeschichte, II, p. 197.

‡ Comp. H. Muller, Geistl. Erquickstunden, I, p. 121; and elsewhere. Dresden, 1814. Menod, Ausgewählte Schriften, VIII, 124ff. VI, 18ff. Bielefeld, 1862.

§ Comp. K. Sack, christliche Apologetik, p. 88f. 1829.

still walked upon the earth; Paul, the conqueror of the world, and the practically edifying James. Each one is different from all the rest; each is a holy man of God in his own way, with his own knowledge of God, and with his own picture of Jesus in his heart; and yet through them all there pervades the same Spirit, which announces the same truths from the beginning of Genesis to the close of John's Revelation. These truths are synonymous in whatever passage we find them, and are presented in progressive clearness and profundity.*

"But," says one who wishes to hold me to this point, "I would like to believe that this is true; I would like to perceive this one Holy Spirit. But as I look at the Holy Scriptures they crumble before me, just as every other book, into single human words; I see nothing of the Spirit." Laplace spoke on this wise when he said that he had penetrated the heavens and many stars, and yet had found no God. The Spirit is invisible, and he who has nothing from it in his heart will find it nowhere; man only perceives that to which he is inwardly related. Dr. Strauss has written a biographical series of highly gifted men, who went down because of their internal vacillation and want of moderation. We mean his biographies of Hutten, Schubart, and Märklin, which, indeed, are excellent books. But a child can relate the life of Jesus with better understanding than he who has broken all the gospels to pieces in order to build again with their ruins. In the same way one may cut up the Passion Music into single tones, the Sixtine Madonna into brush strokes, and the Strasburg Minster into stones, and yet by this useless undertaking he will certainly not be able to find either the genius of Bach, or of Raphael, or of Master Erwin, for the very reason that the spirit is invisible. But if even in art we must assign what is undiscoverable by man in the sphere of the beautiful to the inspiration of genius derived from God, (Exod. xxxi, 2ff.,) how much more will we have to say here—where the question is one of salvation, blessedness, and that which is not discoverable by man in the realm of the true and the good—that inspiration has exercised authority? And in the sphere of art the genius of individual masters has brought into being, by their living creations, standards of the beautiful that have varied with the varying

* Comp. Herder, Werke zur Religion und Theologie, XII, 162ff. 1829.

times;* but in the Holy Scriptures we find a literature pervading twenty centuries, whose living creations do not offer one standard of truth here and another there, but all present one harmony of revelation and one edifice of doctrine. Thus it is plain that we cannot speak here of individual revealing geniuses, but that there must be one inspiring Spirit, which is elevated above all times, and to which the difference in times merely serves as a means to extend its radii in always more exact designation from the center to all parts of the circumference. And such a Spirit is only the Spirit of God.

In these conclusions I have assumed the internal connection of the Holy Scriptures, by which they constitute an articulated organism, a body, as it were, for the soul of revelation. In fact, every impartial observer can see that this harmonious adaptation proves itself. It is not limited to the affinity of the doctrinal import in the individual books, but it is historical. The conclusion of the Book of Revelation in the New Testament cannot be understood without its foundation and development in the Old Testament; and if the attempt should be made to interpret the profound words of the prophets without their fulfillment in the New Testament, they would not become simply pious wishes, but altogether unintelligible. A connection between prophecy and fulfillment which, according to the allusions of Jesus, every-where distinguish the New Testament writers, particularly Matthew and John, encompasses the whole Bible. And that prophecy has grown out of a divine guidance of the world's destiny, and particularly out of that of the people of Israel. History itself appears plainly as prophecy and is described as such; and the grandest sign of it is, that he who here speaks is at the same time the one who acts, who governs the fate of humanity. As the laws and rules of the world (Isa. xlv, 18, 19) are created by God that it may become a theater for the deeds of men, so have also the destinies of men their own laws and rules, and the Lord lays down his own ordinances clearly and plainly in his revelation. The revelation by deeds and that by words go hand in hand. Thus God was worthy of revealing himself by continuous deed and word, for God is living. A God who did not reveal himself would

* Comp. my Abhandlung über kritische Massstäbe in der Tonkunst, in the Deutsche Musik Zeitung, (Vienna.) No. 43ff. 1862.

be as good as none at all—he would be dead. In the beginning of the Scriptures it is the seed of the woman, all humanity, in whom the promise is concentrated. As early as the ninth chapter of Genesis the promise becomes more special, and is confined to the descendants of Shem; from the twelfth chapter of Genesis it is confined to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; in chapter xlix, to the tribe of Judah; and in 2 Samuel, chapter vii, it is from the house of David that the eternal King of God's kingdom shall come. And all these stages are marked by great turning points in the history of God's kingdom; by the fall, the flood, the call of the patriarchs, the death of Jacob, and the kingdom of David. Then, further on, there ripens, amid the sufferings of the Babylonian captivity, the knowledge that the world must be redeemed from sin by substitutional suffering; and finally, we are led over into the New Testament by the prophecy of Zechariah, that the revealed God himself shall be pierced, and from his wounds there shall flow a fountain for the atonement of the sins of the world. Zech. xii, 10; xiii, 1. This fulfillment is the very blossom of the institutions of office in the Old Testament—the priesthood, the kingdom, and the high-priesthood—whose multiplicity and incompleteness join together in the one perfect Christ. Side by side with this there proceeds from the outset the opposition to God in the world; the defiant nations build a tower of Babel at the beginning; and Babel remains historically and symbolically the name for the God-hating nations from the beginning of the Scriptures to the end of John's Revelation. But as the unity of sin was disintegrated at the tower of Babel into the diversity of languages, so has the diversity of tongues again been united at Pentecost, in Jerusalem, in the little group of twelve Apostles. They were understood by all who heard them; they said to one another, "How hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born." Yes, this connection of the Scriptures spans the whole history of the world. This becomes plainest when we consider the opposition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, though it may also be seen elsewhere.* It was just at the great turning point in time—when the Semitic kingdom of the Assyrians began to crumble to pieces, and the Median Indo-Ger-

* De Pressensé, "History of the First Three Centuries of the Christian Church," (German ed.,) I, p. 114ff. 1862.

mans entered the history of the world in the east, and the Roman Indo-Germans entered it on the banks of the Tiber in the west—that the greatest of the prophets, Isaiah, spoke of the Messiah's reign over all nations, and of the time when the heathens shall no more go to their oracles but to the sanctuary of Jehovah to receive law and doctrine.* Isaiah ii. And as in the history of the world, so also in the Scriptures themselves, are the clasps and rivets by which the great whole is held together, marked plainly enough. The beginning of John's Gospel (ch. i, 1) unites with the beginning of the first account of creation, Gen. i, 1; Matthew i, 1, to the beginning of the second, in Gen. ii, 4; Mark i, 1, 2, to the conclusion of the Old Testament, Mal. iii, 1; and our Lord himself connects the beginning of his labors as a teacher (Matt. v, 1ff.) with the beginning of the Book of Psalms. Psa. i, 1.

This is only a small selection from the abundance of witnesses to the grand organism of the Holy Scriptures, in comparison with which all the later influence of God's Spirit is merely reproductive: every thing is perfectly original and new in its place; and from this organism we cannot sunder the smallest member without destroying the harmony of the whole.† In fact, not merely the single writings, but the present form of their collocation, is a masterpiece of divine purpose far excelling all human art; and the sense of unity and necessity in this wonderful diversity, which could not escape William von Humboldt,‡ must become more and more an historical certainty and a strongly established conviction the more profound are our inquiries. And the most learned man in the Scriptures whom our evangelical Church has produced, J. A. Bengel, has said with propriety that this observation is incorporated with the rule that the *entire* Scriptures,§ and not merely individually extracted portions, must be the ground of our life and faith. ‖

* Comp. M. Niebuhr, the work already quoted, p. 170f.

† Comp. Staudt, "Fingerzeige in den Inhalt und Zusammenhang der heil. Schrift, second ed. Stuttgart, 1863.

‡ "Briefe an eine Freundin, I. p. 132. 1848.

§ Comp. Goltz, "Die Theologische Bedeutung J. A. Bengels und seiner Schule." (Reprinted from the "Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie,") p. 7ff; and Oetinger, "Bibl. Worterbuch," published by Hamberger, p. xxvi. 1849.

‖ It is on this ground that the right of historical criticism, which has lately been contested in a manner equally groundless and bitter, receives its real light and

It now remains for us to reply to an objection that has been made to the inspiration and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures; namely, that their contents do not harmonize with the recent results of natural science. We must say, first of all, that there must be no disregard of the manner and place where this conflict should take place. The natural sciences have to do with the investigation of the laws by which nature moves in its regular course. The Bible, on the contrary, has nothing to do with the establishment of those laws. It has to do with the divine control of human destiny, with the revelation of God's nature, and of God's deeds and purpose for our salvation. It nowhere lays claim to being a book of instruction on the natural sciences; and it even has no absolute point of contact with them. There is only one passage to my knowledge in the Holy Scriptures where there is any thing said on the order of nature, (Gen. viii, 22,) "While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease." What natural science would declare this a false piece of instruction?

"But," it is said, "contradictions occur. The Bible does not propose to give any instruction on natural laws, but it speaks of events in nature, for example, at creation, in a manner which does not harmonize with the results of natural science at the present day." But it must be here asked, What results are meant? Shall the Bible harmonize with the Neptunists, or with the Plutonists; or with which of the different theories of development by which the natural science of the present day has bridged over this obsolete opposition? Should it entertain materialistic fundamental views on the nature of life, with Moleschott, or realistic ones with Harless, or idealistic ones with Carus?* All these fragmentary theories spring up just as soon as natural science leaves its sphere as a science of rules,

authority. If the Holy Scriptures be established on the historical connection of God's doings and words—to declare which the holy men were led by the Spirit to behold those deeds—then it is of high importance to search for the dates and authors of the Holy Scriptures; and the Holy Scriptures themselves lead us to this inquiry, for in some of the books, for example, Kings and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author is not mentioned. The task and limits of biblical criticism arise of themselves from the principle which cannot be ethically refuted, that biblical criticism is the application of conscience to the sacred historical records.

* Comp. Virchow, in F. W. Schultz's "Schöpfungsgeschichte, p. 127. 1865.

and arrogates to itself a right to speak on the origin and ground of things known only to God. This is the department of revelation, and in the presence of the contradictions in which natural science becomes involved by its arbitrary usurpation, Augustine's admonition is still of application: "Let us leave those who tell us that they will give us certain information, but who only require of us an uncertain faith; and let us turn to those who require us to believe at the outset that which we do not yet understand, in order that we may be strengthened in spirit by faith to be worthy of knowing what we believe." Or, how would we feel if we were to open the Bible and did not read, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," but that doctrine for which Alexander von Humboldt "had only a smile," namely, that at the beginning there was mud, and that this, dead as it was, has brought forth life from itself. How would we feel if to this there should perhaps be united the whole Darwinian theory, that the first imperfect creatures, utterly helpless as they were, gradually ejected from themselves increasingly better types; and if, finally, we did not read of the highest stage, the creation of man, "I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made," (Psalm cxxxix, 14,) but Czolbe's maxim, that man is nothing more than a Mosaical picture, mechanically combined from the most diverse atoms? It is plain that a writing in which these and many such "results" of modern natural science are brought together must not only kill every peculiarly religious feeling, but even require more faith of its readers than the most narrow-minded monk has required of his fanatical adherents.

And, in conclusion, it is clear that the most of these objections which have been urged against the Holy Scriptures on the score of their opposition to the natural science of our days *is founded on a want of historical perception.* A respect for history requires of every one who is acquainted with it to deduce from what is perceived and communicated the rules and laws of what has happened,* but not, by a self-constituted system, supported only by some experiences of to-day or yesterday, to wish to play the master over what has happened, whether it be possible or not. According to Bacon's maxim, we have "to

* Comp. Hase, "Neue Propheten," second ed., I, p. 81. 1861.

extend our mind to the breadth and depth of the mysteries of what has *occurred*, and not to mutilate what has occurred by the limited measure of our mind." The greater the wonderful powers of God are in nature, for the discovery of which science daily proposes new problems, so much the greater should, in truth, become the modesty of learned people, and their confession that their knowledge even now is only at the very beginning of the fragmentary work. But it is just those sciences which have most to say on experience being the only measure of all things that are frequently the most despotic tyrants over all experience.

Thus these sciences ignore the fact that experience can be adduced as such a general and evident proof for the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures that nobody can refute it. All the discoveries of science are accepted by the great multitude with simple-hearted sincerity and confidence; who will calculate where the means and abilities for control are wanting? But, at all events, the practical man will impose that confidence in the learned man if the machine which the latter has constructed for him accomplishes what he has promised. Now, does God's word in the Holy Scriptures accomplish less than it promises? I can say that it accomplishes more. Of all nations of modern times, only the Anglo-Saxons and the Germans—in whose hands the Reformation has placed the Bible—have produced a classical literature whose clearness and profundity can be compared with that of ancient times, while the writings of all other people are ever declining lower and lower in hopeless disease.* And it is just the Bible nations that have produced a peculiarly Christian philosophy, which towers above that of the ancients in that it, having been fructified by the historiography of prophecy and the Holy Scriptures, has become a philosophy of history. Thus Scripture has, in fact, accomplished more than it has promised; for all its pledges never say that it will grant these blessings.

But it is enough for us here to see the great degree to which Scripture has fulfilled what it *has* promised. To him who accepts it as God's word it promises peace of soul. Micah vi, 8; Rom. ii, 10. Ask one who believes the Scriptures on this

* Comp. Schelling, "Rede über Werth und Bedeutung der Bibelgesellschaften," in his collected works. Part I, vol. ix, p. 247ff. Stuttgart, 1861.

wise if he has no peace; there is none to answer. It promises to bring salvation and blessedness to all men. Psa. i, 2; Rev. xxii, 7, 14. And where is the book that can so perfectly satisfy all men as the Holy Scriptures? It has been lately said that we must regard the Bible and explain it just as we would every other human book. And if we do this, it will even then be plain to us that though the Bible be explained in a perfectly natural way, it must still be a book above all books, a book for humanity, because it is not like every other book which is designed for and comprehensible by certain periods of time, certain nations, and certain stages of civilization, but its streams of life flow equally to the throne and to the hovel, to old age and to youth, to the learned and to the unlearned, to the soldier on the field and to the old widow upon her sick bed; it is not bound by the measure of the wealth and intellectuality of its readers, but only by the measure of their faith. What was it that caused all our people to exult in Luther's translation of the Bible as in a savior who could remove the want of the century? Did they rejoice because they received it as only a new accession to the Oriental sciences, and in having become acquainted with a new and interesting literature? No, but because a book was presented to them which speaks the language of humanity, the language which God alone could teach. Finally, it promises to man, by its power, victory over death. That promise has been kept in a bloody way through the centuries of the first persecutions of the Christians, and through the later centuries, when the Holy Scriptures were in conflict with the Roman Inquisition. All who have died in joy died in the faith that the Holy Scriptures are God's word; and because they believed it, the Holy Scriptures helped them to conquer death. And there is present in the memory of the present day the time of the German War of Liberation, whose history is but another proof that the more submissively a man bows before God's word, the more unswervingly does he stand in the presence of the despotism of tyrants and the misery of his age. I need only call to mind Stein and York, Arndt and Schenkendorf, Perthes and Fichte, Schleiermacher, and Frederic William III. and Queen Louisa.

The time of new proof may soon come. It will be well for him who has so received the Holy Scriptures into his heart that

they have become to him God's revelation, and the source and power of life, so that their promises may also be fulfilled in him. The Scriptures will never pass away; the word shall stand. But he who has not God's word will pass away, and this judgment is already begun.

Art. IV. — MATHEMATICS AS AN EDUCATIONAL INSTRUMENT.

In order to exhibit the value of mathematics as an educational instrument, it is necessary to take a preliminary view of the science itself, to consider its scientific bearings and practical applications, and to analyze the methods and mental processes requisite to its successful cultivation.

A strong statement of the value of mathematics is no disparagement of other sciences or of other departments of research. The field of science is vast and greatly diversified; but all of its departments are linked together in mutual dependence and the most perfect harmony. This follows from the nature of truth, the discovery, development, and classification of which is the object of science. Though there are many truths apparently disconnected, yet between them there is no contradiction. All truths exist in harmony. When Paul insisted on faith as a prime element of Christian doctrine, is it to be inferred that he attached no value to works? On the other hand, when James recommended works, are we to understand that he depreciated faith? Since Paul's especial subject was faith, while that of James was works, though each admitted the importance of the truth taught by the other, it is reasonable to expect that their writings should exhibit diversity without inconsistency. Paul says, "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These are good and profitable unto men." James says, "But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering."

In developing a given subject, it is not to be expected that the writer should turn aside to consider the importance of other subjects not immediately connected with his own. We do not consider the mathematics all of science, nor that they should

claim our exclusive attention, nor that other sciences are not important; but we do claim that they hold an important place in the family of sciences—a place which, in many respects, can be occupied by no other. Let others establish the importance of the languages, the natural sciences, the metaphysics, the arts, or literature, and we shall rejoice; but should we demonstrate the value of mathematics, if others do not rejoice, let them, at least, not object.

Mathematics is the science of quantity.

It does not aim at the direct measurement of quantity, for that would require mechanical art, not science. It considers unknown quantities in their relations to known, and by means of these relations it teaches how to deduce the values of the unknown. The following familiar example will sufficiently illustrate its spirit: *To determine the width of a river.* From a station on one bank, the bearing of a point opposite on the other bank is taken. Then a straight line is run a measured distance, in a given direction, and again the bearing of the point on the opposite bank is taken. We then have a triangle, the angles and one side of which have been determined by means of these preliminary measurements. Now, from these known values and the known relations of the sides to the angles of a triangle, the required distance is readily determined.

The branches of mathematics may be thus classified:

I. Pure Mathematics.

1. *Arithmetic* - - { Mental. / Written - - - { Elementary. / Higher.
2. *Algebra* - - - { Elementary. / Higher.
3. *Geometry* - - { Elementary. / Higher - - - { Analytical. / Descriptive.
4. *Trigonometry* - { Plain. / Spherical.
5. *Mensuration.*
6. *Calculus* - - - { Differential. / Integral. / Calculus of Variations.

II. Mixed Mathematics.

1. Book-keeping. 2. Surveying. 3. Civil Engineering. 4. Navigation. 5. Mechanics. 6. Optics. 7. Astronomy.

Let us now briefly consider these branches in the order in which they can most profitably be studied.

The first, by common consent, is arithmetic, which is the science of numbers. Mental arithmetic should first be studied. In this branch problems are solved in the mind without the aid of written characters, thus calling into exercise the attention and the memory as well as the reasoning powers. Written arithmetic should be commenced before mental arithmetic is finished. In this we have an illustration of a principle important to be observed throughout the course—the advanced portions of each branch should be studied in connection with, or after, the elementary portions of the next higher branch. A twofold advantage is thus gained—the principles of the higher branch assist in overcoming the difficulties of the lower, and the mind thus acquires a breadth of view and power of resource which will enable it to grapple with and overcome difficulties which otherwise would be insurmountable.

For its present perfection, written arithmetic is indebted to the Arabic notation, the characteristics of which are the simplicity of the figures, the decimal scale, and the device by which the orders of units are denoted by the place of the figures.

Its vast superiority over the Roman notation is at once seen if we attempt to multiply two numbers together expressed by the two methods. Thus, let it be required to multiply MDCCCLXVII by DCCXLIV, or 1867 by 744. The mind thus learns an important lesson which is applicable to all departments of investigation: *Success depends, to a great degree, on the means employed.*

The elementary processes of arithmetic have been brought to perfection, and are so well understood as to require, in this connection, no further elucidation.

Elementary algebra should follow elementary arithmetic, and precede higher arithmetic.

Algebra is that branch of mathematics which treats of the general relations of quantities by means of symbols. In this branch the mind is trained to reason on the general relations of quantity, and learns the true scientific method. It thus acquires a most powerful instrument for investigation, which may be applied in various departments of science.

Having acquired such a knowledge of algebra as to be able to manage radicals and solve equations of the second degree,

the mind will be furnished with such resources as will enable it to study higher arithmetic with great pleasure and profit.

Higher arithmetic is a philosophical development of the subject, embracing rigorous demonstrations and the scientific discussion of general principles and the more difficult subjects. The use of algebra in these discussions is a fine example of the mutual dependence and application of the various branches of mathematics.

Book-keeping, by single and double entry, should follow next in order. It is indispensable in business life, and, at the present day, is well taught in commercial colleges.

Next follows higher algebra, which treats of equations of all degrees, their formation, solution, discussion, and general theory. Permutations and combinations, indeterminate coefficients, the binomial theorem, series in general, logarithms, probabilities, indeterminate and diophantine analysis, etc.

Algebra is one of the most important of all the branches of mathematics, forming the basis of the transcendental analysis.

Elementary geometry should be studied simultaneously with higher algebra, as they mutually illustrate each other.

Geometry is the science of position and extension. It has for its object the determination of the properties and relations of points, lines, angles, surfaces, and volumes.

Beginning with definitions, axioms, and postulates, it establishes, by a course of reasoning unrivaled for the beauty and conclusiveness of its logic, a vast body of interesting and important principles. The reasoning employed in geometry is of two kinds—direct and indirect. Direct reasoning is of two kinds: 1st. *By superposition*, in which case one magnitude is proved equal to another by showing that they can be made to coincide in all their parts. 2d. By a logical combination of propositions, till the proposition to be proved is reached as the conclusion.

Indirect reasoning is also of two kinds: 1st. The *reductio ad absurdum*, in which a proposition is proved true by assuming it to be false, or, which is the same, its contradictory to be true, and reasoning logically on this assumption till a conclusion is reached which is the contradictory of a known truth, and therefore false. Now, since true premises and logical reasoning can never give a false conclusion, and since the reasoning is logical,

the assumed premise, the contradictory of the given proposition, is itself false, and if false, is contradictory, which is the proposition to be proved, is true, and is hence demonstrated. 2d. The *exhaustive method*, in which the disjunctive syllogism is employed. Suppose it is required to prove that two magnitudes are equal. It is done, according to this method, thus: There are three, and only three, suppositions possible, and only one can be true, and one must be true—the first is greater than the second, less than the second, or equal to the second. It is then shown that the first and second suppositions involve contradictions, and that they are therefore false. The argument can now be regularly stated, calling the magnitudes A and B, thus: A is greater than B, less than B, or equal to B. But A is neither greater than B, nor less than B. Therefore, A is equal to B.

Whatever be the method of demonstration employed, the perfect conclusiveness of the reasoning is a fact which strikes every mind conversant with the subject. Geometry is justly regarded as the most perfect branch of science. Next in order is trigonometry—that branch of mathematics which treats of the solution of triangles. On account of its extensive applications, trigonometry claims an important place among the branches of mathematics. It is indispensable to those who desire to pursue independent investigations in physics, or even to read with pleasure and profit the best works on the subject. Mensuration is the application of arithmetic, geometry, and trigonometry in calculating the numerical values of geometrical magnitudes.

Surveying is the art of making such measurements of any portion of the earth's surface that a map of that portion can be drawn and its area calculated. Its importance is unquestioned.

Navigation is the science which enables the mariner to conduct in safety his vessel at pleasure over the ocean. It has been of incalculable service to mankind in advancing the interests of commerce, civilization, and religion.

Analytical geometry is that branch of mathematics in which the magnitudes considered are represented by letters, and the properties and relations of these magnitudes made known by the methods of algebra. It has two branches—determinate

and indeterminate. Determinate geometry has for its object the solution of determinate problems. Indeterminate geometry has for its object the analytical investigation of the properties of lines and surfaces. It treats of the equation of the point and line in a plane and in space, the conic sections, embracing the circle, the ellipse, the parabola, and the hyperbola, with their particular cases, the discussion of the equation of the second degree between two variables, and the discussion of surfaces of the second order.

Descriptive geometry treats of the methods of representing magnitudes on paper, and gives graphic solutions of problems. It is indispensable to the architect and engineer, and affords an excellent mental discipline.

The calculus is that branch of mathematics which treats of the nature and form of indirect functions. It is divisible into three branches—the differential, the integral, and the calculus of variations. The first and second branches treat of determinate functions, the third of indeterminate. Three distinct fundamental conceptions have been formed of the calculus: that of Leibnitz, or the differential method, remarkable for its flexibility and power; that of Newton, or the method of limits, characterized by its logical simplicity; and that of Lagrange, or the method of derived functions, distinguished for philosophic generality. Practically, the differential method is superior to the others, and is in general use. The immediate object of the differential calculus is to obtain the differentials of functions of all possible forms. It is applied in developing functions into series, in finding the maximum and minimum values of functions, in the discussion of curves, and in many departments of physical science.

The integral calculus, which is the reverse of the differential, explains how to find the function which, differentiated, will produce the given differential. It is applied to the rectification and quadrature of curves and cubature of volumes, and to various departments of physics.

The calculus of variations treats of the forms of indeterminate functions, the laws of variation, and the application of these laws to the other branches of mathematics.

The object of the calculus, considered as an instrument of philosophical investigation, is to find the equations expressing

the laws of relation between the facts of the material world. In general, to accomplish this object, differential equations are first established, directly by the differential calculus, or indirectly by the calculus of variations. The integral calculus is then applied and the differentials are eliminated, producing algebraic equations. These equations are then solved by the known methods of algebra, giving formulas. To the constants in these formulas the proper numerical values are assigned, and by the known operations of arithmetic the final results are obtained. Thus, the calculus, which is last, is made first; and arithmetic, which is first, is made last.

The calculus is an instrument of exhaustless power and resource, and its thorough mastery is an acquisition of untold value.

Mechanics is that branch of mathematics which treats of force and the laws of equilibrium and motion. It opens a wide field for the exercise of the philosophic mind; but the indispensable requisite to success is a thorough knowledge of pure mathematics, and with this knowledge genius will find its reward.

After the mind has been furnished with the resources which are afforded by a knowledge of the preceding branches, civil engineering can be pursued with profit and success.

Optics is the science which treats of the laws of light and the phenomena of vision. The principles of mathematics are applied with great effect in these investigations, and optics is ranked as an important and interesting branch of science.

Astronomy is the science which treats of the heavenly bodies, their motions, magnitudes, forms, distances, densities, etc. This department of science has reached the greatest perfection of any of the applications of mathematics.

This sketch, though necessarily hasty and imperfect, will serve to give something of an idea of the vastness of the subject.

Turning our eyes to the external world, we encounter, on every side, quantity in the various forms of number, space, time, matter, force, and motion. To investigate these various forms of quantity, to ascertain their properties and relations, to determine the unknown by means of a logical deduction from its relation to the known, is the broad field of mathematical science.

What a boundless expanse is here opened for investigation!

But it is not on that account uncertain or vague. Founded on axioms and ascertained facts, it conducts us by a chain of reasoning unbroken and irresistible. From the simple relations of numbers, we gradually rise to the more comprehensive and general reasoning of the higher analysis; and at every step we find this peculiar characteristic—the principles are brought to light with a clearness and power of demonstration at once irresistible and certain.

We need not see as through a mist, nor blindly follow the rules laid down by others; but we may approach, with a strong hand tear aside the vail, and look upon truth, in its primitive simplicity and beauty, face to face. The certainty of its first principles and axioms renders certain any conclusion we reach, whatever course of investigation we pursue, provided only that we reason logically. A fine example of this is found in the elements of geometry. Reasoning from definitions, axioms, and postulates, and demonstrated propositions, we rise with certainty, step by step, and explore a vast field abounding with new and interesting truths. We consider, in order, lines, angles, triangles, quadrilaterals, polygons in general, the circle, planes and volumes, and at every step we find the same clearness of demonstration and certainty of truth.

If we go on to the conic sections, the equation of curves and the higher order of analysis, the reasoning is more elevated and abstract, but, on that account, none the less satisfactory. What a field for investigation! Commencing with the plainest truths, we are conducted by an unbroken chain of reasoning to the profoundest depths. We grasp infinity, and, with the most refined analysis, mark the nicest shades and smallest differences.

The utility of the practical applications of mathematics is universally acknowledged. A knowledge of arithmetic and book-keeping is indispensable in business pursuits. Surveying is applied in establishing the lines of individual proprietors, and on a more extended scale in drawing the boundaries between States and nations. By the science of navigation the mariner is enabled to sail in safety over the trackless deep, calculate his true position, and direct his course with certainty to the desired harbor. Commerce is thus rendered comparatively safe, and the nations of the earth are reaping the advantages

which it confers in the exchange of the productions of every clime, and also the greater advantages of an interchange of thought, thus awakening a laudable emulation which greatly accelerates the progress of the race.

A knowledge of mathematics is the key to many of the sciences. It enables us to unlock the door of the temple of science, to enter, and to read therein the profoundest mysteries, and to drink refreshing draughts from the purest fountains.

The value of mathematics as an educational instrument is no less important than its practical bearings. Our views of education should be enlightened, comprehensive, and liberal. A complete education embraces the proper development and adequate preparation of the whole man for the active duties of life. The physical system is to be exercised and strengthened; the moral powers are to be developed and rightly directed; the intellectual faculties educated and furnished; the taste cultivated and refined; the emotional and passional elements purified and controlled; the will strengthened and energized for the great battle of life. Numerous are the means which must be applied to accomplish all these objects, so essential to our success and happiness. Far be it from us to discourage any from pursuing a liberal course in any department of science, literature, or art. Mathematics should not be made the exclusive means of mental discipline; yet it is pre-eminently adapted to perform a certain part in the great work of education, a part which cannot be so well performed by any other branch of study.

Mathematical studies tend to induce correct mental habits. They cultivate the power of attention; for they require, as an indispensable requisite to their successful cultivation, a concentration of the mind upon the subject. All are aware of the value of this power of mental control, and how essential to success in difficult investigations is the ability to concentrate our minds upon the given subject, so that we can bring all our powers to bear upon it, and all our resources, with all their combined force. In such cases the most abstruse subjects must yield, and gradually unfold themselves to our minds. Since the power of controlling the mind, in conformity to a general law of our nature, is developed by exercise, and since the mathematical studies bring this power into vigorous action, they are therefore adapted to its development.

Again, mathematical studies become very useful in cultivating the habit of diligent application; for this is demanded as an indispensable condition of success. Difficulties sometimes baffle all efforts for days, and even weeks, and they are overcome only by the most untiring efforts. But how richly are such efforts rewarded! The joy of discovery is, to the investigator, when the truth first stands out in bold relief, a rich compensation for all his toil. He has learned a valuable lesson which he does not forget to apply in after life.

Not only do the mathematics cultivate correct mental habits, but they sharpen and strengthen the intellectual powers. Commencing with the rudiments, we find the first principles and processes adapted to awaken the mind to its earliest successful exercise of its reasoning powers; and in the course of its progress, it clearly perceives the reason for every process and the certainty of every result. The logical powers are developed by the vigorous exercise thus afforded, and from a familiarity with the finest models of reasoning, the mind learns to appreciate clear demonstration.

The business of education is not only to develop the mind, but *to furnish it with such resources as will enable it to achieve success.* The fact that many departments of physical science cannot be successfully studied without a mathematical training, and the growing importance of these sciences, render a knowledge of mathematics an indispensable acquisition to every one desiring to pursue, to any considerable extent, the study of nature. A thorough knowledge of mathematics thus becomes an instrument of exhaustless power, and when skillfully wielded will achieve splendid triumphs.

Portions of mathematical science, as descriptive geometry and astronomy, afford a fine exercise for the imagination. What a splendid picture is the solar system, with its planets and their satellites, and blazing comets, sweeping round their grand central orb in perfect obedience to the law of universal gravitation!

Certain objections have been raised to the study of mathematics, chiefly in reference to their value as a mental discipline.

Conspicuous among those who have assaulted the mathematics on this ground is the late Sir William Hamilton. But, if we mistake not, Hamilton, in his famous controversy with

Prof. Whewell, displays the aims and qualifications of an advocate rather than those of a judge. We call attention to a few points in Hamilton's review of Whewell's pamphlet, entitled "Thoughts on the Study of Mathematics as a part of a Liberal Education." Hamilton takes Whewell to task for inquiring into the origin and nature of first principles, as wholly beyond the domain of his science. He says: "We doubt, indeed, whether one mathematician in a hundred has ever possessed an opinion, much less a right to an opinion, on the matter." Again: "The very propositions on which these sciences build their whole edifice of demonstration are as well known by the tyro when he opens his Euclid as by the veteran Euler or La Place; nay, they are possessed, even in prior property, by the philosopher, to whom, indeed, the mathematician must look for their vindication and establishment." If these principles are as well known to the tyro as to the veteran, it is because they are intuitive, and cannot, therefore, be referred to principles ulterior to themselves as the ground of their explanation. Wherefore, then, must the mathematician look to the philosopher "for their vindication and establishment?"

But let us see how Hamilton vindicates first principles. He says in his "Philosophy of Common Sense:" "Demonstration, if proof be possible, behooves us to repose at last on propositions which, carrying their own evidence, necessitate their own admission; and which being as primary, inexplicable, as inexplicable, incomprehensible." Imagine the mathematician applying to the metaphysician for a vindication of his principles, and receiving the answer, "They are primary, inexplicable, incomprehensible!" What an instructive interview! Because these principles are intuitive, they are as perfectly understood by the mathematician as by the philosopher who can give no better account of them than to say that they are intuitive. Who can convict the mathematician of error in regard to his principles? Can as much be said in favor of the philosopher? The founder of the positive philosophy, M. Comte, the equal of Hamilton in intellect, if not in authority, says of metaphysics: "After two thousand years of psychological pursuit, no one proposition is established to the satisfaction of its followers. They are divided, to this day, into a multitude of schools, still disputing about the very elements of their

doctrine." We do not quote the foregoing to disparage metaphysics; for, equally with mathematics, they have been our study and our delight. But it shows how easily, and with apparent truth, allegations can be made against the noblest of the sciences.

The history of science will attest that every great step in the progress of science in general, and in the intellectual elevation of the human race, was preceded by renewed activity in respect to metaphysical inquiry, as is evinced in the epochs of Socrates, Abelard, and Bacon.

Again, Hamilton quotes, with apparent approval: "The mathematician is either a beggar, a dunce, or a visionary, or the three in one." This is verified by those illustrious beggars, dunces, and visionaries—Newton, Leibnitz, and La Place!

Again, he quotes: "A great genius cannot be a great mathematician." Compare this statement with Hamilton's own account of Descartes: "The greatest mathematician of his age, and in spite of his mathematics, also its greatest philosopher."

The assertion, "A great genius cannot be a great mathematician," harmonizes beautifully with the following: "We are far from meaning hereby to disparage the *mathematical genius* which invents new methods and formulas, or new and felicitous applications of the old." It also harmonizes, even more beautifully, with the following quotation made by Hamilton: "There is, no doubt, a point at which the mathematics themselves require that luminous power of invention, without which it is impossible to penetrate into the secrets of nature. At the summit of thought, the imaginations of Homer and Newton seem to unite."

Again, Hamilton says: "The principles of mathematics are self-evident; and every transition, every successive step in their evolution, is equally self-evident. But the mere act of intellect, which an intuitive proposition determines, is, of all mental energies, the easiest—the nearest, in fact, to a negation of thought altogether. But as every step in mathematical demonstration is intuitive, every step in mathematical demonstration calls forth an absolute minimum of thought; and as a faculty is always evolved in proportion to its competent degree of exercise, consequently mathematics, in determining reason to its

feeblest energy, determines reason to its most limited development." What in this quotation is true of mathematics, is equally true of all reasoning. The passage from the premises to the conclusion of any argument is always self-evident; for if not, as the premises are the only warrant for the conclusion, the step is unauthorized, and the conclusion unwarranted. But the true test is found in discovering and arranging the premises; in originating, not in following, a demonstration. Granting that some equations, when stated, can be readily solved by rule, yet others require the exercise of the greatest ingenuity to place them under the form to which the rule is directly applicable. Again, the equations which express the relations of the known and unknown quantities of problems, frequently cannot be found without the severest exercise of the mind.

It would afford us great delight to test those who so flippantly assert that "mathematics call forth an absolute minimum of thought," in originating demonstrations, transforming equations, stating problems, and overcoming difficulties which, as yet, have baffled the ablest mathematicians. They might find that more than a minimum of thought would be required to meet the test.

The assertion, "It requires, indeed, a most ingenious stupidity to go wrong, where it is far more easy to keep right," is contradicted by the experience of every teacher of mathematics. Even in geometry, where the demonstrations are usually given in the text-book, in which case the above assertion might be expected to prove true, if at all, a perfect demonstration is the exception, not the rule.

In reference to the class of faculties cultivated by the mathematics, one of Hamilton's authorities says: "We shall, first of all, admit that mathematics only cultivate the mind on a single phasis. . . . So, likewise, on the other hand, the memory and imagination remain in a great measure unemployed; so that, strictly speaking, the understanding alone remains to them, and even this is cultivated and pointed only in one special direction."

Another of his authorities says: "Persons of an oblivious memory are likewise disqualified; for if the previous steps be forgotten, not a hundredth of the others can be retained—such, in these sciences, is the series and continuous concate-

nation of the proofs." This looks as if the memory is called into exercise by mathematical study, as well as the understanding.

Another of his authorities says: "Some delight to investigate the *causes* and *substances* of things, and these are the philosophers properly so called. Others again, inquiring into the relations of certain accidents, are chiefly occupied about these, such as *numbers* and *figures*, and, in general, *quantities*. These latter are principally potent in the faculty of the imagination, and in that part of brain which lies toward its center; this, therefore, they have hot and capacious, and excellently conservative. Hence, they *imagine* well how things stand in their wholes and in relation to each other. But we have said that every one finds pleasure in those functions which he is capable of performing well. Wherefore, these principally delight in that knowledge which is situate in the imagination, and they are denominated mathematicians." This looks as if the imagination was exercised as well as the understanding and the memory.

Again, we find it quoted: "It is an observation which all the world can verify, that there is nothing so deplorable as the conduct of some celebrated mathematicians in their own affairs, nor any thing so absurd as their opinions on the sciences not within their jurisdiction. I have seen of them those who ruined themselves in groundless lawsuits; who built extravagantly; who embarked in undertakings of which every one foresaw the ill success; who quaked for terror at the pettiest accident of life; who formed only chimeras in politics; and who had no more of our civilization than if born among the Hurons or the Iroquois. Hence, sir, you may form some judgment of *how far algebra conduces to common sense.*" In reply to this quotation, it may safely be said that the author of it is an illustration of the fact that *mathematicians are not the only persons destitute of common sense.* Take lawyers, physicians, divines, farmers, mechanics, merchants, statesmen, or philosophers, and there will be found, even among distinguished names, those who entertain the most absurd notions on subjects not within their jurisdiction. *Hence, sir, you may form some judgment of how far any of the pursuits of life conduces to common sense!*

As to the influence of mathematics on religious belief, we find the quotations: "To cultivate astronomy and geometry is to abandon the cause of salvation and to follow that of error." "It infects them with fatalism, spiritual insensibility, brutalism, disbelief, and an almost incurable presumption." This harmonizes beautifully with the quotation from Voltaire: "Mathematics leave the intellect as they find it."

The necessary connection between mathematics and skepticism is illustrated in the case of Newton and Leibnitz. That its neglect is conducive to a correct estimate of moral evidence and to piety is illustrated in the case of Gibbon, whom Hamilton quotes thus: "As soon as I understood the principles, I relinquished forever the pursuit of mathematics; nor can I lament that I desisted before my mind was hardened by the habit of rigid demonstration, so destructive of the finer feelings of moral evidence, which must, however, determine the actions and opinions of our lives."

Seriously, is it necessary to state that a man's religious belief does not depend on his mathematics, when mathematicians, as well as the rest of mankind, are divided in reference to matters of religious faith? Mathematical study, so far from inducing skepticism in the present writer's own mind, has induced faith. Perplexed with the uncertainty attending political, moral, and religious questions, he had almost concluded that, to the human mind, truth must forever remain unknown, or, at least, its certainty be but probable; and, in his despair of ever finding it, was in danger of lapsing into universal skepticism. But a study of mathematics revealed to him the fact that there is truth which can be certainly known and positively demonstrated. Confidence was restored as to the reality of truth, and faith inspired in the ability of the human mind to succeed in its discovery and demonstration, and this confidence and faith have been carried into other departments of thought.

Again, Hamilton says: "It will be easily seen how an excessive study of the mathematical sciences not only does not prepare, but absolutely *incapacitates*, the mind for those intellectual energies which philosophy and life require." But is it not evident that the disqualification arises, not from a knowledge of mathematics, but from an ignorance of other things? Should it be said that an exclusive study of mathematics leads

to an ignorance of other things, we reply, *no one advocates such exclusive study.*

Again, he says: "Mathematics afford no assistance, either in conquering the difficulties, or in avoiding the dangers which we encounter in the great field of probabilities wherein we live and move." This objection has force only on the condition that it can be shown that it is the exclusive business of life to deal with probabilities, and that, in dealing with probabilities, the mathematics render no assistance. But is it the exclusive business of life to deal with probabilities? Many of the ordinary affairs of life, as well as the great commercial transactions of the world, require exact calculation. The arts of the surveyor, the navigator, the engineer, and the architect, so essential to the welfare of mankind, depend upon exact science. Even the problems which "we encounter in the great field of probabilities wherein we live and move," have their exact parts whose determination requires rigid deduction. Let it be remembered that there is a mathematical theory of probabilities which is applied to life assurance, which involves the interests of such vast and increasing numbers of our people.

In the ordinary forms of probability, the mathematics are not chargeable with the delinquencies and failures so frequently witnessed. To prepare the mind to grapple successfully with such forms of probabilities is not the province of mathematics. They make no such pretentions. A steamship is not to be condemned because it cannot accomplish a voyage overland across the continent. Let every thing stand or fall on its own merits, and let not one thing be chargeable with the deficiencies of another. Observation, experiment, and an enlarged experience, together with common sense, are essential to success in the various callings of life, and their absence is attended with failure; but let not these failures be charged upon mathematics which are in no wise responsible.

Again, he says, in reference to the comparative utility of the analytic and synthetic departments of mathematics as affording discipline for the mind: "Some are willing to surrender the modern analysis as a gymnastic of the mind. They confess that its very perfection, as an instrument of discovery, unfits it for an instrument of mental cultivation; its formulas mechanically transporting the student, with closed eyes, to the

conclusion; whereas the ancient geometrical construction, they contend, leads him to the end, more circuitously, indeed, but by his own exertion, and with a clear consciousness of every step in the procedure. Others, on the contrary, disgusted with the tedious and complex operations of geometry, recommend the algebraic process as that most favorable to the powers of generalization and reasoning; for, concentrating into the narrowest compass the greatest complement of meaning, it obviates, they maintain, all irrelevant distractions, and enables the intellect to operate, for a longer continuance, more energetically, securely, and effectively. The arguments in favor of the study thus neutralize each other, and the reasoning of those who deny it more than a subordinate and partial utility, stands not only uncontroverted, but untouched—not only untouched, but admitted."

In claiming that the arguments in favor of the two methods neutralize each other, Hamilton draws his conclusions from the unfavorable opinion which the advocates of each method hold respecting the other.

Now, these views are negative rather than positive. It is far more rational to draw conclusions from the positive knowledge which the advocates of each method possess. The advocates of the analytical method find beauties and advantages in that method; hence, these beauties and advantages are there. The advocates of the synthetic method find clearness and discipline in that method; hence, clearness and discipline are there. The two methods, therefore, when both are together studied, instead of neutralizing each other, must, by their combination, result in a higher beauty, clearness, and discipline. Some have complained of the encroachment of modern analysis upon the synthetic method of the ancients; but this is the inevitable result of the progress of the science. Synthetic geometry will always have its place; but in the higher investigations, and the more difficult applications of mathematics, to abandon the analytic method for the synthetic would be analagous to abandoning the railroad, the telegraph, and all the inventions which characterize the present age, and going back to the primitive customs of our fathers.

It is a part of the business of education to furnish the mind with the facilities for investigation; and no more effective

instrument for this purpose has ever been discovered than the modern mathematical analysis.

We have always admired the opening paragraph of the first article written by the "Autocrat of the Breakfast-table" for the *Atlantic Monthly*. He says: "I was just going to say, when I was interrupted, that one of the many ways of classifying minds is under the heads of arithmetical and algebraic intellects. All economical and practical wisdom is an extension or variation of the formula, $2 + 2 = 4$. Every philosophical proposition has the more general character of the expression, $a + b = c$. We are mere operatives, empirics, and egotists, until we learn to think in letters instead of figures." We cannot, however, give our unqualified approval of the following quotation from the same popular author: "Given certain factors, and a sound brain should always evolve the same fixed product with the certainty of Babbage's calculating machine. What a satire, by the way, is that machine on the mere mathematician! A Frankenstein-monster, a thing without brains and without heart, too stupid to make a blunder, that turns out results like a corn-sheller, and never grows any wiser or better, though it grinds a thousand bushels of them. I have an immense respect for a man of talents *plus* the mathematics. But the calculating power alone should seem to be the least human of qualities, and to have the smallest amount of reason in it; since a machine can be made to do the work of three or four calculators, and better than any one of them. Sometimes I have been troubled that I had not a deeper intuitive apprehension of the relation of numbers. But the triumph of the ciphering hand-organ has consoled me. The power of dealing with numbers is a kind of detached level arrangement, which may be put into a mighty poor watch. I suppose it is about as common as the power of moving the ears voluntarily, which is a moderately rare endowment." The mere calculator is not a mathematician; but when a machine is invented which will work itself, and not only calculate, but develop formulas, conduct demonstrations, originate methods, it will then do to exclaim, What a satire on the mathematician!

The calculating power, though by no means the highest mathematical faculty, is nevertheless useful, and not to be despised.

It is the tendency of the human mind lightly to esteem what it cannot possess, and to draw consolation for its deficiencies from the consideration that what it does not possess is not worth possessing. This characteristic of humanity has been well satirized by the fable of "the fox and the grapes."

The mind adapted to excel in mathematical pursuits is not the mere calculator, nor the sluggish intellect, but is of that class which, as a general thing, succeeds best in language, in philosophy, and in the higher metaphysical speculations.

The mathematical sciences have given us some of our noblest thoughts. How have our conceptions of the perfections of God, and the vastness and grandeur of his empire, been exalted by the revelations of astronomy! By the discovery of the law of universal gravitation, mathematical science has demonstrated that all worlds are linked together in mutual dependence, constituting a *universe*. From the unity of creation we infer the unity of the Creator, a truth of the highest importance in theology, and which can, in no other way, be so satisfactorily determined.

That mathematical studies, when properly pursued, call forth and develop the powers of the mind, stands forth a demonstrated fact. Even the analytical method, which some, while admitting its wonderful perfection as an instrument of investigation, regard as of little value as a means of education, is, when properly employed, in the highest degree efficient as an educational agency. One may, indeed, passively follow, with little apparent profit, the tranformations of an equation, through a variety of forms, till he reach the conclusion that a projectile describes a parabola. But no little effort is required to originate the demonstration, or even to ascertain the reasons for the successive steps.

There is a most beautiful philosophy in the analytical method which renders it a most profitable subject for study; and the application of this method, in investigating the laws of natural phenomena, presents an inexhaustible field for the exercise of the highest intellectual powers.

We do not advocate the exclusive study of mathematics, the tendency of which would be to neglect observation and experiment, and to attempt to deduce the facts, principles, and truths of

science from a few fundamental axioms. But even this result is chargeable, not to a knowledge of mathematics, but to a neglect of observation and experiment. Let this evil be corrected, not by neglecting mathematics, but by widening the range of thought, by enlarging our views from a comprehensive survey of the vast field of human knowledge. Because air is necessary to sustain life, shall we, therefore, neglect food and drink, and live on air? Let us have the air, by all means; but let us have the bread, beef, and water also.

Let sufficient time be given in our colleges for the mastery of the calculus, and we shall not witness those ridiculous exhibitions of the celebration of its obsequies; but our students would go out with their minds not only sharpened and invigorated by its acquisition, but furnished with the most powerful instrument for investigation.

We would respectfully suggest that our college courses are overcrowded. So much is attempted that but a superficial scholarship is secured; and, what is still more deplorable, bad habits of study are induced. Let the languages, the mathematics, rhetoric, logic, mental philosophy, and the principal physical sciences be thoroughly studied, and the scholarship of our students is secured. Other studies, deemed important, might be made a requisition for the second degree.

Art. V.—THE BIBLE BETTER THAN THE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL.

The civilized world is watching the great Council at Rome. Prelates, priests, and rulers may there take counsel together against the Lord and his Anointed; but "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision." Long before the Council met, a higher decree than it can make had been declared. A higher Sovereign than the Pope is set upon the holy hill of Zion. "Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him."

In a certain professed religious community, calling itself the "liberal Church," we are pointed to the advanced social and moral condition of humanity, and are exhorted to believe that

it is the result of the movements of human agencies and civilization. In their view, the kingdom of God advances as the enterprise of men opens the way: through the cleft mountain, across the bridged river, over valleys exalted, crooked ways straightened and rough places made plain, the elements of an improved social condition are marching, and thus the glory of the Lord is revealed! The Bible, and what the Bible plainly teaches, is forgotten or ignored by such inculcation. Effect is mistaken for cause. The history of civilization would never have been written had there been no Bible studied and followed.

In another professed religious community, calling itself "the Catholic Church," ecclesiastical despotism attempts to shut up the Bible, and to smother the truths of revelation with the traditions and opinions of men. They would have the human mind renounce its freedom, and deny the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures.

Every Protestant press and every Protestant pulpit should unite to expose these great defections from true Christianity, and now, more than ever, proclaim the grand truth, that the Bible, divinely inspired, is the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice. To its mandates alone should human belief and human conscience bow. Every other gospel is a spiritual deceit, though it wear the livery of the schools, or canonize its dogmas in councils. The happiness which society enjoys in civilized life, and the character which fits men for happiness in the life to come, must be attributed alone to the Bible. Whatever adorns the history of humanity, its government or laws, its civil or religious liberty, its social institutions or moral life, emanates from the influence of that divine book. "The vision is shut up—the testimony is sealed—the word of the Lord is ended, and this solitary volume, with its chapters and verses, is the sum total of all for which the chariot of heaven made so many visits to the earth, and the Son of God himself tabernacled and dwelt among us." Beyond what it reveals, the mysteries of eternity are unknown. Omniscient Wisdom has stored therein marvelous truths which otherwise had dwelt, unrevealed to men, in the bosom of God. It is the emanation from the divine mind, and is replete with the treasures of heavenly wisdom. Perfection has here attained its end; for

while science advances, and art matures, and human destinies move on, no contribution will be brought to this volume of truth. It was perfect before; will be perfect while time endures; and, beyond its perfect revelation of truth, there is nothing but the wisdom of God. Mankind will never possess any other repository of heaven-revealed truth, nor any other day-star of their hopes charmed with living power for the salvation of the race.

There is but one perfect charter of liberty for the nations of earth; but one infallible guide for ecclesiastical councils and the consciences of men. Enlightened communities owe their culture and elevation to that source; self-governments trace to it their principles of liberty; and Christian men find there an unfailing fountain of happiness. The principles of this book alone will put an end to the contests of governments; abolish wars; convert oppressors into benefactors; establish just laws; cure the ills of society, and implant heaven-born hopes in human bosoms. The history of humanity, past, present, and to come, will justify these claims. But was there ever an Œcumenical Council whose decrees were not tainted by the original vice of doubtful ethical principles, and were not full of the seeds of evil? While their professed aims have been the establishment and propagation of religious truth, false principles and equally false history have, oftentimes, furnished their chief staple.

When the consequences of a false judgment in matters pertaining to man's eternal well-being are so tremendous, too much cannot be done to secure the true foundation of his religious belief. It was well remarked by a British statesman, that "we, as fallible creatures, have no right, from any bare speculation of our own, to administer pains and penalties to our fellow-creatures, whether on social or religious grounds. We have the right to enforce the laws of the land by such pains and penalties, because it is expressly given by Him who has declared that the civil rulers are to bear the sword for the punishment of evil-doers and for the encouragement of them that do well. And so, in things spiritual, had it pleased God to give to the Church or to the State this power, to be permanently exercised over their members or mankind at large, we should have the right to use it; but it does not appear to have

been so received, and, consequently, it should not be exercised." There is on the face of the earth no prelate, parliament, or council to whose decrees men are bound to submit their private judgment in matters of religious faith. Nor can the reason of man, in his fallen state, of itself find out the will of God.

If, then, on points of faith, we may not trust to our own unaided speculations, nor depend upon the assumed infallibility of prelates, synods, or councils, where is the sure foundation to which we may go, and on which we may safely rest? Certainly not to spirits hot with contention, heady with argument, uncomposed by solemn thought, or ruffled by the concourse of temporal interests, but to the sure word of the living God. Here is sufficiency, not alone for the intellect, but for the heart. The natural powers of man are to be mistrusted, but not the voice of Him whom the sun and stars obey in their courses. We have no doubt whence this word has come, nor wherefore it was sent. It has descended from the throne of heaven; and what an awful weight is there "in the least iota that hath dropped from the lips of God!" All through the space of four thousand years mute nature gave its solemn testimonies to the authenticity of this word. The mountain quakes while its Author speaks; and while holy men pen its inspired truths, the sun stops in his circuit, the sea rolls backward from its bed, the fire forgets to consume, human spirits soar into the third heaven, and dramas are enacted in prophetic vision, which after ages have realized. The universal Church has given its witness to this authenticity. The constant relish and affections of the regenerated heart utters the same testimony. This alone is entitled to the name of THE TRUTH. It sets open the gates of salvation, and, for lost man, points the way to everlasting life.

At the Council of Rimini a creed was subscribed, when, according to Jerome, the world was surprised to find itself Arian. Ninety Bishops assembled at Antioch under pretense of dedicating a cathedral. History says, "they composed an ambiguous creed, faintly tinged with the colors of semi-Arianism." It is charged that at the great Council of Milan, "honors, gifts, and immunities were offered and accepted as the price of an episcopal vote." The fathers of the Council of Trent were divided on the nature of election. The Pontiffs,

infallible as they claimed to be, shrunk from decisions on the question, and often varied in the decisions they, at times, reluctantly pronounced. Monks and prelates have displayed sanctity and splendor; have agreed that the chair of St. Peter "should be raised the first of the Latin line;" but the councils they have frequented were not oracles of truth. Theological champions have debated on opposite sides for months, while the principal questions agitated were, the kind of bread to be used in the communion, the nature of purgatory, the supremacy of the Pope, the single or double procession of the Holy Ghost, the venial sins of the faithful, and the scruples of unimportant words and syllables. Opinions on points which were not viewed as important by the primitive Church were made the test of a genuine attachment to Christianity, and decisions were tinctured with the passions and prejudices of those engaged in controversy, and not with the pure love of divine truth.

But turn from the impenetrable darkness of human systems to the clear light of revealed truth. Mark its adaptation to the situation of man in all ages—its fitness to increase the comforts and to alleviate the trials of life; to prepare him for death and for a blessed immortality! No intellect is so lofty as to be able to soar above its great themes; and no healthful mind is so low as to be unable to reach its highest wisdom. Here are the most ancient records in the world, yet the best adapted to the present time. Here is the most learned book in the world, yet the book which the simplest mind may comprehend. It is replete with wisdom above that of the sciences, yet is adapted to man's intelligent and spiritual nature. Its scenes traverse the ages past and the eternity to come, yet it pours unclouded day on the present hour of gracious visitation.

No wisdom of man was ever able to invent this book. Here are elements of philosophy, jurisprudence, and theology, above all that human intellect could produce. Here are history and chronology from the dawn of creation to the end of time. Here narrative, allegory, and poesy lend their fascinations to the page. Here breathe the inspiration of prophecy and the rapture of holy song. Here resound the rifts of angel anthems and the voices of the company of heaven. Here is disclosed the secret of that mighty faith which dwelt with patriarchs and

prophets, apostles and martyrs; and here are words of reconciliation to lost man which were brought from heaven by the ever blessed Son of God.

The student of the Bible is an historian of six thousand years. Never lived such a citizen of the world, nor such a contemporary with all generations. When the morning stars sang together, and when all the youthful progeny of creation at the great christening received their names, he appears on the scene. He listens to the preaching of Noah to the antediluvians. He beholds "the waters which prevailed exceedingly upon the earth," when only one family are saved. He traverses the plain in the land of Shinar when the whole earth is of one language and one speech. He visits Armenia, the cradle of the human race, when, by right of primogeniture, it is allotted to Japhet. He explores Ethiopia with the children of Ham, and tarries with his son, Mizraim, in Egypt, while they found that Arabic nation which has continued in the same country to the present day. He is at Shinar and Babel with the sons of Shem. He hears the Lord call Abram and bless him with a promise of Christ. He is on Moriah while Isaac inquires of his father, "Where is the lamb for a burnt offering?" He watches with Jacob during that night when a ladder is set upon the earth with its top reaching to heaven, on which the angels of God ascend and descend. He is an Egyptian under Pharaoh, sees Joseph sold to Potiphar the captain of the guard, and is a spectator at the scene when Joseph makes himself known to his brethren. He journeys with Israel and his descendants from Canaan to the land of Goshen. He is at the death-couch of Isaac as he utters the memorable prophecy, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come." He is at the Nile when Moses is taken from his ark of bulrushes. He witnesses the ten plagues desolate the whole of the Egyptian territories save only the land of Goshen. He is at the institution of the first passover, when the angel of the Lord executes judgment "against all the gods of Egypt," passing over the doorposts of the Israelites sprinkled with blood, and when Pharaoh rises up in the night and bids Moses and Aaron go forth with the children of Israel from among his people. He sees that monarch and his hosts madly pursue the army of Moses to the borders of the

Red Sea, and hears the command of Israel's illustrious leader, "Fear ye not! stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." He witnesses the passage of dry land made in the sea, and the children of Israel go through it unharmed. He beholds the return of the waters as they overwhelm "the chariots and the horsemen and all the host of Pharaoh." He sings, with the delivered people, on the shore of safety, the triumphal "song of Moses," indicted by the wisdom of God, and which shall be again sung by all the redeemed, with the harps of God, when they shall stand by "the sea of glass mingled with fire." He visits the encampments of the Israelites during their forty years' journey in the wilderness; he perceives them led by a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night. He beholds the miracles wrought in their behalf, and the astonishing manifestation of Jehovah on Mount Sinai as an epitome of his law is delivered to Moses on the tables of stone. He hears Moses teach the congregation of Israel his inimitable ode. He is with him on the top of Pisgah while he looks upon the promised land "to the utmost sea." He sees the Church established in the land of Canaan, which is the subject of promise in the Pentateuch. He observes the chief events of the Hebrew republic from the time of Moses and Joshua to the reign of Saul, the first king. He is present at the anointing of David, the son of Jesse, and a witness of the achievements and renown of the psalmist king. His wonder is excited by the reign of Solomon—the building and dedication of the temple, the erection of the king's palace, his great wisdom, the magnificence of his court, and his shameful apostasy from the God of his fathers.

A scholar thus informed by the experience of ages is no common man; yet a higher interest attaches to his character while he engages in the devotional strains of the Psalmist's lyrics; as he catches the inspiration of the prophetic words; as he worships at Bethlehem with the wise men and the shepherds; as he weeps before the cross on Calvary; and as he looks steadfastly toward heaven, whither his ascended Lord has gone, and believes the words of the "men in white apparel," "this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

Have any of the great Councils of the world dwelt on themes like these, or promulgated truths so rich with divine instruction? One text of Scripture is more potent than all their decrees. The doctrines of the Bible are a better creed and a stronger defense of the faith delivered to the saints. They have kept watch over the safety of the Church like the angelic guard over the gate of Eden. They are the pure fountain; the theses of men are but unfiltered streams.

The greatest question that can engage the study of men in their probationary state was started by Job in the early dawn of revelation—"How should man be just with God?" If infinite Justice be, as it must, scrupulously exact, how shall an offender escape the penalty of the oft-broken law? God himself hath devised "means that his banished be not expelled from him." The scheme far transcends all man's intellectual comprehension, and the purpose of God in the mystery of redemption cannot, therefore, be a subject of man's knowledge, save only as it is revealed to him. In vain should we appeal to the dialectics of philosophers or the decrees of councils. Christianity bows not to such authority, and rests not on such uncertain support; but deeper and surer are the solid foundations of her faith, even the established fact of the great atonement for sin and the revealed truth that whosoever believeth shall be saved. Human philosophy has tried what it could do without the Bible. The French literati, in the skeptical age, were deeply versed in human lore. The surprising advances of that age in science and philosophy, doubtless, brought many blessings to humanity. The mind, long fettered by the dialectics of centuries, was emancipated, but the light of Christian faith and hope was put out, and the altars of religion torn down. A modern philosophy usurped the places of both. Lamartine says: "From the seat of geometry to the consecrated pulpit, the philosophy of the eighteenth century had invaded and altered every thing. D'Alembert, Diderot, Condorcet, Bernardin de St. Pierre, Helvetius, La Harpe, were the Church of the new era. One sole thought animated these minds—the revolution of ideas. Arithmetic, science, history, society, economy, politics, the stage, morals, poetry—all served as a vehicle of the modern philosophy. It ran through all the

veins of the times; it had enlisted every genius—spoke every language."

The faith by which we lay hold of the record of divine truth is not like that which apprehends the logic of philosophy; but it is that faculty of the soul prepared for, and made commensurate with, what it is given to receive; not an intellectual power supplied with earthly knowledge, but a spiritual faculty attuned to a state of aptness and liberty to apprehend the truths revealed in the word of God. Compared with this, the highest scientific knowledge is as earth to heaven. Poetry and philosophy may be exercised in the "sharpening of the thoughts," but they have no other kindred with the soul's higher aspirations after the things of God. "Works are but the hem of the garment of faith, which waves abroad to the liberal observation of men, but the soft and warm substance of the garment, which enwrappeth the tender frame of our own being, and protecteth it from inclement weather and rude wintry blasts, that is faith." Is this faith, which is the condition of salvation, learned in the schools or bred in the councils? The food on which it feeds is the nectar of heaven; it is not conveyed in the earthen vessels of human philosophy.

It is not asserted that important Christian doctrines have not been discussed in the so-called General Councils, nor, indeed, that some of them have not been of service to the Church. Those of Nice and Chalcedon confessedly were; but the value of their decisions "depends, not on their authority, but upon their conformity to the word of God." At times when error and despotism prevailed, their public deliberations were means of arriving at the truth, and resulted in some good. The doctrine of the person of Christ was settled at Nice, A. D. 327; but they have more often debated over dubious traditions, and promulgated dogmas which Christendom has rejected, and in respect of which the Councils have not agreed with one another.

The Nicene creed, accepted by all Christendom, is in conflict with the Council of Chalcedon. The decretals of Isidore, which the Council of Trent and the Roman Church have set forth as the grounds of the Papal power, are declared by "the unwavering criticism of the modern civilized world" to be "a gross imposture." The Apocrypha was incorporated into

the sacred canon at the fourth session of the Council of Trent; but, at the Reformation, it was rejected by Protestants as forming no part of the Jewish oracles. The Council of Carthage committed the same error in the year 397, and so did the Council of Hippo, which met four years earlier. But these writings, which bear internal evidence of their apocryphal character, which, according to their own terms, advance no claim to inspiration, and which were not quoted by the Saviour or his Apostles, have never been enumerated in the books of holy scripture by the Jews or the early Fathers. Councils have not defined the authorship of any of the sacred books; but they have recognized the text of the Vulgate as sacred, though it is replete with confessed and manifold errors. The truth is, inspiration does not reside in councils, but it does dwell in the revealed word of God. Since the days of the Apostles, councils have not met by divine direction, nor pronounced decrees by inspiration. There was one inspired Council—the first ever held in the Christian Church—which was convened at Jerusalem, and was composed of "the Apostles and elders." "When there had been much disputing," by Cerinthus and other Pharisees, who "labored to unite the law and the gospel, and to make the salvation promised by the latter dependent on the performance of the rites and ceremonies prescribed by the former," the Council declared its inspired judgment against the error. *Peter* first showed how, without any right of circumcision, God had made choice that "the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." *Barnabas* and *Paul* then related what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them; and then *James*, who presided in the Council, pronounced the final decree, "*that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles, are turned to God.*" Acts xv, 19. Well would it be if all ecclesiastical councils had adhered to that inspired sentence. It is asserted by Rome that Peter, before this Council sat, had received his commission and title from our Lord, which gave him pre-eminence in the Church; but, so far from his asserting it, he assumes the lowest place in the Council, does not preside in it, is mentioned by James not by any title, but by his name of "Simeon," and he, with the other Apostles, assents to the occupancy of the chief place in the Council by the Apostle James. The decree

sent forth from that Council, with the letter and messengers of the Apostles and brethren, allayed a wide-spread disputation, established many in the faith, and the Church had daily accessions of believers. It was not a bull or encyclical of Peter as pope; but a letter of all the Apostles and Elders who composed the Council, written after this manner: "The Apostles and Elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." Acts xv, 23. It had been revealed to Paul that his mission was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, and, according to this revelation, he had journeyed to Jerusalem to attend the apostolic Council, and there, in the public assembly, as well as in private conferences with eminent men, he proclaimed how God had blessed his ministry among the heathen. "They saw," says he, "that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was to Peter." Gal. ii, 7. He was sent to preach it to the Gentiles and Peter to the Jews. The latter went to Antioch, where Paul "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." He could not, therefore, have been thought to be chief among the Apostles, nor endowed with the faculty of infallibility.

The claim of the Councils to represent the Christian world is absurd. After the fourth century only Bishops were admitted; the lower clergy and the laity being excluded. It has been justly observed that, in the strict and proper sense of the term, no Œcumenical Council has ever been held. But there were seven councils admitted to be œcumenical both by the Greek and Latin Churches. Rome adds twelve more, making nineteen in all. The beginning of the system is traced to the Council at Jerusalem, composed of the Apostles and Elders; but that differed from all others in that it was under the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit. From that time until the middle of the second century, no such assembly was convened. After the middle of the second century there were synods or councils, composed of representatives from particular districts, but none comprising delegates from all parts of Christendom. On the theory of Romanists, the Pope can convene a general council; and, when convened, it represents the Church universal, because they exclude from the pale of the Church those who are not Roman Catholics. But such a supposed council

is now, even according to a confession of a Roman Catholic, "a chimera." "The ablest advocate of the Papal theory whom the Roman Church has ever produced—Joseph de Maistre—declared, '*Que dans les temps modernes un Concile Œcuménique est devenu une chimère.*'" Gregory of Nazianzus, who presided for a time over the second Œcumenical Council, said: "I am inclined to avoid conventions of bishops; I never knew one that did not come to a bad end, and create more disorders than it attempted to rectify." How can men with unregenerate natures, with deceitful and deceivable hearts, represent the Christian Church? Natural sinfulness and alienation from the love of God are not qualities that fit men as representatives of Christianity. "God resides among his own." Those alone who have received the word of doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, and who have been conformed to the image of Christ through the blessed influences of the Spirit, belong to that holy communion called the Church, and are alone fit to represent it. Yet secular princes and rulers have found place in the councils, and because they saw their thrones tottering, have offered their adherence to the Church in return for her support. They looked for the continuance or advancement of political dominion in return for their alliance with the Church. Many who were ignorant of the principles of Christianity have thus "prostrated themselves at the feet of the chief priest of Rome." While any thing was to be gained by such secular alliance, the Roman Church was quick to seize the apparent advantage; but, in the ninth century, when disunion had every-where weakened the civil authority, when the crown of Charles was broken, "and its fragments scattered over his former empire," then the forged decretals of Isidorus appeared. The impostor who had fabricated these pretended decrees used the barbarous Latin of the ninth century, and in them he makes the ancient bishops of the classic times of Tacitus and Quintillian speak the corrupted language of his own day. He blindly attributed to the Romans, under the Emperors, the obsolete customs of the Franks. His Popes quote the Bible from the Latin translation of St. Jerome, who lived several hundred years after them; and he makes Victor, Bishop of Rome in 192, write to Theophilus, who was Archbishop of Alexandria in 385! It is unimpeached history, that

the Popes did not blush to lay claim to the alleged verity of this transparent imposture. For ages it was "the arsenal of Rome," and the Vatican resorted to it for barriers of defense and weapons of attack. It was authoritatively proclaimed as the strength of the whole Roman cause, and the basis on which the pontifical system of later days was built. Yet the fabulous character of these false and pompous decrees has been demonstrated, and is even admitted by enlightened Catholics.

The Council of Constance was called to put an end to the schism caused by the several claimants of the Papacy, and which had lasted for thirty years. The pretended heresies of Wiclif and Huss were condemned, and, notwithstanding the assurances of safety given him by the Emperor, Huss was burnt. A point warmly debated was, whether the authority of an Œcumenical Council was greater than that of the Pope. A few years subsequent, the Council of Basle declared that "a General Council is superior to a Pope." This Council and the Pope were for years in conflict; the one persisting in its sessions at the place of convocation, and the other plotting for the dissolution of the Council. At length the Council declared the Pope contumacious, and suspended him from the exercise of all jurisdiction, temporal and spiritual. He, however, continued to be generally recognized as the lawful Pope, during the subsequent four years, till he died. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, for October, 1869, has shown that the present Council at Rome is not any Œcumenical Council at all, but is only a "fantastic," Papal and "revolutionary" assembly. In its convocation the Pope has not adhered to the traditions and precedents necessary to constitute a General Council. It "has been summoned by a priest, without advice or concert with any sovereign—convoked, not in any free town or neutral territory, but in the actual palace of the very Pontiff whose authority it is intended to exalt;" and it contains "not one of those representatives of Christian States, whose presence in all former Councils was an essential feature of such assemblies." It is in no sense, therefore, entitled to the appellation of "Œcumenical," but is simply a prelatical assembly of some of the dignitaries of the Papal Church.

While we would speak with all kindness and charity of the deluded men who conscientiously adhere to the communion of

Rome, yet we arraign that Church before the bar of history as antiapostolic and antichristian. No warrant from Christ, the Apostles, or Scripture, can be found to sanction her heresies, excuse her persecutions, or apologize for her great defection from Christianity in withdrawing the Bible from her people, and erecting in its place the follies, mummeries, and dogmas of human invention. True Christianity, civilization, and the progress of enlightment must wage continual war with her. "Such a Church, though it wear the awe of vast ages; though the cloud of one thousand years veil its mysterious dome; though saintly faces look on you from painted window and pictured ceiling, and stories of heroic and martry piety are lettered and figured all over the marble column and frescoed wall; though music, like rift of angelic anthem, breathes through its long-drawn aisles and fretted vaults—nothing can save." As certainly as the sun dispels the darkness of night and the mists of morning, so will truth triumph, and the last vestige of error disappear before the pure light of the word of God. The press is giving new wings to that word, and before its power, whatever opposes it in the ecclesiasticism of Rome must give way. It is the perpetual well-spring of religious life to the soul, and the only text-book of true Christianity in all the world.

Who are they that have loved this book, and have believed its sublime truths? They are Prophets and Apostles, the Fathers and martyrs of the Church; the holy and the good of every age. They are that glorious, unnumbered company, discerned in apocalyptic vision by the banished Apostle from that isle in the Ægean. They are that Church of believers which is the bride of Christ. They are that line of faithful followers of their Master which is traced from the days of Paul, through the catacombs of Rome, where their memorials still survive; through the dens and caves of the earth, where their bodies await the morning of the first resurrection; through the recesses of the Alps; over the plains of Smithfield, and along the gray moors of Scotland, whence their triumphant spirits ascended in chariots of fire. They are those who have declared plainly that they desired "a better country, that is, a heavenly;" who have feared the Lord, and spoken often, one to another, of the universal theme of the Cross, and the key-note of whose sweetest hymns still rings with the love of

the Redeemer. "They shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels." We will glance along the history of the Councils in vain to find nobler names, or spirits brighter with the luster of personal piety.

Art. VI.—THE TWENTY-SECOND PSALM,

AS ILLUSTRATING THE SUBJECTIVE METHOD OF PROPHETIC CHRISTOLOGICAL REVELATION.

In developing the thought proposed as the theme of this article, we will first notice the Messianic import of the agonistic portion of the Twenty-second Psalm, and then call attention to the connection of its historic groundwork with its prophetic application, as an instance of the highest ideal Christophany of the Old Testament.

In graphic delineation of Messiah's sufferings, this wonderful psalm stands side by side with the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. The descriptions of the Saviour's agony are so varied and minutely circumstantial, and so repeatedly quoted in the New Testament, as to leave no doubt of their being predictions in the fullest sense, resulting from a direct prescience of the events. We are overwhelmed with the contemplation of the minute accuracy of the correspondence between the prophetic foreshadowing and its fulfilled reality—the type with its historic archetype.

As to the artificial arrangement of the subject-matter of the psalm, it must be classed with the bipartites; the first division, ver. 1–21, relating to the humiliation and suffering of the Messiah; and the second, embracing the remainder of the psalm, to his triumph, and the glorious results which should follow. The first strophe should be again divided into two parts; the former, ver. 1–11, preferring the Psalmist's complaint to God in great discouragement, with a general description of the nature and severity of his afflictions; and the latter, ver. 12–21, entering more into detail, setting forth, under varied and strong metaphors, the imminent perils and unparalleled sufferings to which he is reduced. The transition from the

twenty-first to the following verses is abrupt, without example except among the most impassioned productions of the Davidic muse. Bishop Jebb says, that "from that awful complaint, prophetical of our Lord's sufferings, to the song of triumph, beginning with ver. 22, the most glorious contrast is presented which the whole book of Psalms affords." In presenting the several particulars of this psalm which relate to our present purpose, we shall follow the order of verses, somewhat in the style of commentary, this being the simplest method of attaining our object.

Ver. 1. *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*] This first utterance strikes the key-note of our Saviour's agony upon the cross. Our Lord reiterated the words toward the close of his sufferings, quoting literally from the Hebrew, though conforming his pronunciation somewhat to the Syriac, or the Syro-chaldaic, as being more conformable to the dialect of the common Palestinian Jews. Matt. xxvii, 46; Mark xv, 34. Thus the Chaldee שְׁבַקְתָּנִי, *shebaktanee*, instead of the Hebrew עֲזַבְתָּנִי, *ahzabhthanee*, words of the same import.

The point of the complaint is not an *infliction*, but an *absence*, a *withdrawal*, from עָזַב, *ahzabh*, *to loosen*, *leave*, *forsake*, as Psalm lxxi, 11; Isaiah xlix, 14; liv, 7. Still it is not a mere negation, but a withdrawal which seems to leave the sufferer a victim to his enemies, subject to all the consequences of their fierce malice and relentless power. This complaint, in the mouth of Jesus, describes the climax of his vicarious sufferings, the awful mystery of atonement. This *forsaking* stands opposed to the *salvation* (יְשׁוּעָה) in the next hemistich, by the law of parallelism, and doctrinally, as applied to Christ, is of profound significance. It was not merely that he was *abandoned* to the death of the cross; the words have a far deeper meaning—a spiritual withdrawal of the light and consolation of the Father's presence. It was at this point that the Son of God emphatically went down to the depths of the ruin of a lost soul, so far as an innocent being could, entering into our state, bearing our sin, "SUFFERING FOR US, the just for the unjust." In the language of Dr. Pye Smith: "The tremendous manifestations of God's displeasure against sin he endured, though in him was no sin; and he endured them in a manner of which even those unhappy spirits who shall drink the fierceness of

the wrath of Almighty God will never be able to form an adequate idea." It was this central point of his agony which seemed to have baffled the human comprehensions of Jesus, and to have excited in him, while yet in prospect, the conflict of most distressing emotions, such as are described in Matt. xxvi, 37, 38; Mark xiii, 33, 34; Luke xxii, 44; John xii, 27; and Heb. v, 7. The mystery of this unfathomable depth of suffering is indicated in the interrogative sense of the Hebrew לָמָּה, *lamah*, literally followed by the *ivατι*, *hinati*, of the Septuagint, and by the Evangelist, Matt. xxvii, 46, *why, wherefore, for what cause*, this dreadful abandonment?

Why art thou so far from helping me] Literally, *far off from my salvation*. In this parallel member the word rendered *far off* corresponds to the previous word *forsaken*. The complaint of abandonment is repeated, with enlargements.

Words of my roaring] Words of my *groaning*, or of my *outcry*. The idea is, that God had withdrawn so far as not only not to deliver, but even not to hear his bitterest and loudest call for help.

Ver. 2. *O my God, I cry in the day time, but thou hearest not, and in the night, etc.*] The abandonment is long continued, nature must soon give out without help. Hence the suffering is greater, and the mystery of delay thickens into deeper darkness.

And am not silent] *There is no silence to me;* I have no quiet. I give myself no rest. Hope stimulates prayer, while restless importunity causes the divine absence to appear more strange and insupportable.

Ver. 3. *But thou art holy*] Faith rallies. Faith reasons. Faith rests herself here. God is holy, and hence he must come to my rescue, for my cause is his cause. I appeal it to his holiness. This oneness of the soul with God, of the soul's cause with his cause, was the firm rock which supported the Saviour. "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." John xvii, 1.

Ver. 6. *But I am a worm, and no man*] An object not only of pitiable weakness, but of loathsomeness and contempt, like a worm generated in putrid substances, as the word often denotes. Exod. xvi, 20; Isa. xiv, 11. "A weak worm and not strong; an animalcule generated from rottenness." *Bythner.*

So men reputed Jesus. "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him there is no beauty that we should desire him." Isa. viii, 2. The Hindoos, in self-abhorrence, exclaim, "What am I? A worm! a worm!" In contempt of others, "Worm, crawl out of my presence." *Roberts.*

A reproach of men, and despised of the people] *A scorn of mankind, and despised of the nation*—exegetical of "*a worm, and no man;*" and parallel to Isa. liii, 3, "He was despised and rejected of men, . . . and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not."

Ver. 7. *All they that see me laugh me to scorn*] *All who see me will mock at me.* This *mocking* (לעג) is literally an imitating the sounds, or mimicry of the acts of another, for the purpose of merriment, of showing contempt and caricaturing, as 2 Chron. xxxvi, 16; Psalm xxxv, 16; Prov. xxx, 17. Compare Luke xxiii, 11, and Matt. xxvii, 28, 29: "And Herod with his men of war set him at naught, and mocked him, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, and sent him again to Pilate." "Then the soldiers stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews!" This is the climax of all mockery.

They shoot out the lip] The idea is that of an opening and protrusion of the lips, somewhat as is denoted by our English word *pout.*

They shake the head] *They wag the head.* Another token of derision. The same word is used Psalm cix, 25, where David also prophetically speaks of Christ's treatment by his enemies. This *wagging* or *shaking* the head, *that is, moving it irregularly, like the staggering motion of a drunken man,* is often used in Scripture. The Septuagint, in the place before us and elsewhere, render it by κινέω, *kineo,* the same Greek word used by Matthew and Mark, "They railed on him *wagging* their heads." Matt. xxvii, 39; Mark xv, 29.

Ver. 8. *He trusted on the Lord*] Literally, *Roll upon Jehovah,* or, *Let him roll upon Jehovah.* It is better to take the verb in the imperative form. His enemies deride his professions of confidence in God by calling upon him now to roll, or devolve himself upon, the Lord, that is, to fully and fear-

lessly cast himself upon, or confide in, God. Their words must be understood as a bitter and heartless irony. The verse literally reads: "Let him roll himself upon Jehovah, he will deliver him; he will deliver him, for he delighted in him." With wonderful accuracy the enemies of Christ unwittingly fulfilled this prophecy, when, as if quoting these very words, they said, "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, since he delights in him." Matt. xxvii, 43.

Ver. 9. *But thou art he that took me out of the womb*] The adversative force of כִּי, *kee, but*, indicates the firm stand which faith now again takes against the bitter taunts and revilings of his enemies. "*But* thou art he." God is my Father. I am his Son. Inimitably touching and beautiful is this appeal! "Thou art he that took me out of the womb." Aye, and for this very purpose. "For this cause came I unto this hour." "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world." John xii, 27; xviii, 37. Was not the miraculous birth of Jesus an eternal pledge of the constancy of infinite, paternal love? "The Lord hath called thee from the womb." Isa. xlix, 1; vii, 14; Matt. i, 23.

Ver. 11. *Be not far from me*] The absence which caused the complaint (ver. 1) still continues. Against it he urges two reasons—"Because distress is near; because there is no helper."

Ver. 12. *Many bulls have compassed me*] Here begins a description of Messiah's persecutors under the names and habits of ferocious wild beasts. Rosenmüller thinks the bulls here mentioned are of the third year. He says, the noun means a two-year-old. They were proverbially ferocious and untamable.

Strong bulls of Bashan] Thrupp thinks the buffaloes of Hermon and Northern Gilead are meant, which were too wild for the yoke, and exceedingly fierce; and refers to Job xxxix, 9–12.

Ver. 13. *They gaped upon me with their mouth*] They opened wide their mouth upon me. This was not an act of scorn, *as the opening of the lip*, (ver. 7,) but of threat, an expression simply of brutal ferocity, of greediness for prey. Hence the comparison which follows, *as a ravening and roaring lion*, which is a rising in the metaphor.

Ver. 14. *I am poured out like water*] My life is profusely

poured out, and cannot be recalled. Compare the phraseology, 2 Sam. xiv, 14, "For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again." In its application to Christ, compare Isa. liii, 12, "He hath poured out his soul unto death." Was it not so? "And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." Luke xxii, 44. Especially how rapidly are the vital forces wasted by the exhausting agonies of the cross!

All my bones are out of joint] All my bones have separated from each other, by enfeebling the muscles and dissolving the ligaments. This is a sensation, and often, to a great extent, a fact, attendant upon crucifixion. See ver. 17.

My heart is like wax] See the figure in Psalms lxviii, 2; xcix, 5; Micah i, 4; Josh. ii, 11; v, 1. Fear seems to dissolve the heart when courage and resolution forsake it. Does not this describe the Saviour's soul-struggle, when he was "sore amazed," "very heavy," "troubled," "exceeding sorrowful even unto death," "afraid." Matt. xxvi, 37, 38; Mark xiv, 33, 34; John xii, 27; Heb. v, 7.

Ver. 15. *My strength is dried up like a potsherd*] "My body is like a potsherd, all whose humidity was burned out in the furnace." *Bythner.* The comparison is twofold, denoting a *shrinking* and *drying* by heat, like a piece of baked pottery, and also, proverbially, *worthlessness*, as Isa. xlv, 9; Lam. iv, 2. The former is here the idea.

My tongue cleaveth to my jaws] The metaphor of the preceding member of the verse is continued. The humidity of the body is being exhausted by pain. The condition here described is one that involves great thirst. This is the specialty of the description. It prophetically points to the complaint on the cross, "I thirst." John xix, 28. After the soul agony of Jesus, which reached its awful climax in the complaint, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" had passed, and nature had returned to a consciousness of its own physical condition, the specialty of the Saviour's bodily sufferings was expressed in the complaint, "I thirst." This sensation rose above all others. It was a natural result of the treatment of the body, as attested by the laws of physiology, and by all analagous facts. The Septuagint, "My tongue is glued to my *throat*," (λάρυγγί,) followed by the

Vulgate Latin (*faucibus*) are incorrect. The version of the Liturgy reads *jaws*. But the word is מַלְקוֹחָי, *malkohha, my jaws*, from לָקַח, *lakahh, he received;* applies to the *jaws*, because they *receive* the food.

Thou hast brought me into the dust of death] A strong expression for "Thou hast brought me down to the grave." On the phrase, "dust of death," compare Psalms xxx, 9; vii, 6. The verb שָׁפַת, *shahpath*, means *to set, put, place*, and sometimes takes the sense of *arrange, dispose*, and hence some would read this, "Thou hast *arranged* me (*laid me out*) for the grave."

Ver. 16. *For dogs have compassed me*] Explained in the next line by "The assembly of the wicked have inclosed me," the verse forming a synonymous parallelism. The dog in Egypt, Arabia, and the East generally is a wild, ferocious, disgusting animal, often belonging to no master, and hence never caressed or regularly fed. His physiognomy is ignoble, and his appearance haggard and disagreeable. These dogs wander in packs like wolves, and human life is in danger from them by night, hunger making them savage and blood-thirsty. Thus their habits, disposition, and appearance make them proverbial for cruelty, impurity, and baseness. Such were David's enemies. He compares them to wild bulls, dogs, and lions; fit types of the persecutors of the holy and blessed Jesus.

Ver. 17. *They pierced my hands and my feet*] Does this describe a crucifixion—the nailing of the hands and feet to the cross? Few passages of Scripture have been more contested than this. The vexed question lies in the true reading and sense of the word translated *pierced*. Jews and rationalistic interpreters have attempted to evade its Messianic application to the crucifixion, and the former have been accused of altering the word in the Masoretic text. On the one hand, כָּאֲרִי, *kaarce*, which is the word in the present Hebrew text, has been translated *as a lion*, which the form of the word admits, taking כְּ, *ka*, (*as, like as,*) for an adverb in composition with אֲרִי, *arce, a lion*. The passage would then read: "For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me; *as a lion* my hands and my feet." But this rendering is blind, and completely destroys the metaphor. For what sense is there in the representation that dogs, or the assembly of the wicked, *like*

lions, had inclosed or seized *his hands and his feet?* This is not the habit of the lion, which has no need to secure the hands or the feet of its victim in order to make it an easy prey. Mudge reads it, "They make holes in my arms and my legs," and says, "The image is of a man encompassed by dogs, and extending his arms to keep them off; but they come about him, and fix their teeth and claws in his arms and legs, as they could not reach his body." But though this method of attack may be suitable enough to dogs, or to wicked men, it is not *lion-like*, and utterly precludes the rendering we oppose.

The learned Dr. Pocock, who was a strenuous advocate of the correctness of the present Hebrew text every-where, contends for it here, and argues that כָּאֲרִי, *kaaree*, is a contracted form (from the plural כַּאֲרִים, *kaareem*) of the present participle Kal, from כָּרַר, *kor*. This gives the rendering, *piercing my hands and my feet*. This, even Gesenius admits, is certainly possible, though extraordinary to find so anomalous a participial form; and this also is Kennicott's position. Parkhurst, in his lexicon, renders it *piercing*, or *the piercers of my hands and my feet*, and adds, "the word in this form may be considered either as a noun or as a participle." This view would suffice to establish the Messianic application of this important passage, though we still adhered to the present Hebrew text. But the probabilities seem clearly to preponderate against this hypothesis. The fact that the ancient versions expressed the word as a verb, seems decisive of the general opinion of the learned, that the original reading was not כָּאֲרִי, *kaari, piercing*, (participially understood,) but כָּארוּ, *kaaroo, they pierced;* the difference in the form of the words being only the difference between the letters, י, *yod*, and ו, *vav*, a difference easily overlooked by a transcriber. Kennicott, in his Dissertations, cites four Hebrew manuscripts in which כָּארוּ, *kaaroo*, is the reading of the text, and כָּאֲרִי, *kaaree*, the marginal reading, and adds, in closing his argument, "there seems to be but little doubt that the former word was the one originally written." De Rossi elaborates the argument. The Septuagint has ὤρυξαν, *they pierced through, perforated*, with which the Latin Vulgate, *foderunt*, agrees. The Chaldee paraphrases the word *biting as a lion;* but this is self-refuting, as is conceded on all hands, and Pocock suggests that it arose from an attempt to

combine the participial sense of כַּאֲרִי, *kaari*, with its similarity to the same form when rendered *as a lion*, and became hence the cause, not the consequence, of the double reading as in the manuscripts above mentioned. But it is not proper to enter further into a statement, in this place, of the argument on this point. The general consent of the ancient versions must, with its strong corroborating testimony, be admitted here as of more weight than the Masoretic text; or, if we fall back upon the latter, we still urge that the participial form and sense above given of the word as it now stands must be considered as encumbered with less difficulty than the modern Jewish rendering, and the only one which meets fully both the metaphor involved and the grammatical connections of the passage. Our English version, therefore, is to be accepted.

Here, then, is a wonderful precognition of the death of the cross—clearly a supernatural revelation. The description finds no literal fulfillment in the history of David, for although the teeth of the "dogs" and the "lions," to which he compares his enemies, and the sharp death-weapons which his persecutors bore, evidently suggested the general imagery, yet the precise enunciation of this single point transcends all that facts or imagination could suggest, either in the history of David or any other person. Neither could the criminal procedure of those times, either among the Jews or any other nation, supply an example answerable to this description, for no death known in law or custom in David's time, or ever known in the world, except crucifixion, combined the particulars here stated, especially the "piercing of the hands and feet." The literal fulfillment was realized only in Christ when nailed to the cross, and pierced by the soldier's spear. Zechariah (xii, 10) is the only other prophet who has specifically foretold this particular in the Saviour's sufferings: "They shall look on me whom *they have pierced;*" concerning which it may be observed, that דָּקַר, *dakar*, *pierced, pierced through*, every-where else in the Old Testament, means a literal *piercing* or *thrusting* through with a weapon, except Lam. iv, 9, where it figuratively denotes the *piercing* pains of hunger. John (xix, 37) quotes this passage from Zechariah as being fulfilled in the *piercing* of the body of Jesus by the nails and spear of the soldiers in the crucifixion, and again quotes it, Rev. i, 7. By these wounds in the hands,

feet, and side of Jesus, exhibited to the inspection of the Apostles after the resurrection, he proved to them the identity of that body which had been crucified. Luke xxiv, 39, 40; John xx, 27. These wounds, the world over, would prove a crucifixion, but no other form of criminal execution known among the nations.

Ver. 17. *I may tell all my bones*] *I count all my bones.* This obtrusion of the bones was partly the effect of wasting sufferings, and partly, as Bishop Mant expresses it, "of the distending of the flesh and skin by the posture of the body on the cross."

They look and stare upon me] That is, my enemies do this. The use of two words so nearly synonymous (נָבַט and רָאָה) *look* and *stare*, is for intensity, and denotes *close watching*. It was the custom to watch the cross while life remained in the victim, to prevent the surreption of the body. The usual guard of soldiers is mentioned by John, (xix, 23.) In the case of Jesus they had cause to fear a popular outbreak in order to rescue the body, and hence the closer watch. Naturally enough, and with minute historic accuracy, Matthew records, "And sitting down they *watched* him there." "The Centurion, and they that were with him, *watching* Jesus." Matt. xxvii, 36–54. See ver. 14. רָאָה, *rahah*, may also be taken in the sense of *to enjoy;* and Mudge says, when it is constructed with בְּ, as in this text, "it has always the signification of *feasting the eyes, regaling the sight*, with the misery of another;" and renders it, "*They see, they indulge their sight on me.*" Cf. the phrase, "*Seen my desire* on mine enemies," Heb., "*Looked on mine enemies.*" Psalms liv, 7; lix, 10; xcii, 11; and cxviii, 7.

Ver. 19. *They part my garments among them*] It was customary to give the garments of the criminal to the soldiers or executioners. But nothing of this kind ever actually transpired with David. His garments were never divided among his persecutors, nor did they ever cast lots for them. But he here describes himself as one already stripped for execution, whose clothes are even now distributed among his executioners. Of Jesus only was this literally true. Under the eye of Jesus, the soldiers, in brutal indifference to his sufferings, sit down beneath the cross, and literally, though unconsciously, fulfill this

wonderful prophecy. Matt. xxvii, 35; Mark xv, 24; John xix, 23, 24.

Cast lots for my vesture] This is an additional and more minute circumstance in the description. Not only the casting of lots, but even the particular part of the raiment for which the lot was cast, is designated. The לְבוּשִׁי, *leboosh*, here denotes the *tunic* or under garment, worn next the skin; as בִּגְדִי, *beged*, in the previous member of the verse, denotes the outer garment, the *mantle* or *cloak*, which, being simply a quadrangular piece of cloth, could be easily divided; but the tunic, answering in fashion somewhat to a man's shirt, could not be divided without destroying its value. In exact agreement with the Hebrew prophet, John (xix, 23) specifies the *tunic* (χιτων) as the part of the Saviour's raiment for which the soldiers cast lots; but Matthew and Mark speak only in general terms, Matt. xxvii, 35; Mark xv, 24, using, ἱματεον, *himation*, in the generic plural to denote *garments*, *raiment*, without specifying any one part, which is not unfrequent, as Matt. xxiv, 18; xxvi, 65; Mark xv, 20, etc.

Ver. 19. *But be thou not far from me, O Lord*] The absence of Jehovah is still lamented and deprecated, as in verses 1, 11. The adversative sense of וְ, *ve*, (*but*,) here well indicates that this absence, this divine withdrawal, is the cause of all his distress, which can find no relief till God shall return. Luther, before appearing at the diet of Worms, cries out in private agony of prayer, "O Lord, why dost thou tarry? My God, where art thou? Come! come!"

O my strength] The noun is in apposition with Jehovah in the preceding member. He appropriates to God the title which best suits his helplessness.

Ver. 20. *Deliver my soul from the sword*] *Rescue me from instant destruction.*

My darling] Literally, *my only one.* As if he would say, *that which is dearest to me, my all;* that is, *my life, my soul*, as in the previous member, to which it is here parallel.

Ver. 21. *From the lion's mouth*] Wicked rulers, whose power is used to devour, not protect, the innocent. See Prov. xxviii, 15; Jer. l, 17. The suppliant is as one upon whom the lion had already opened his mouth.

For thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns]

"That is, *hearing thou hast delivered me*, the cause being put for the effect." *Bythner.* The same Hebraistic form occurs, and is applied to Christ, Heb. v, 7, εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπο τῆς εὐλαβείας, *he was heard from the fear*, or, *from his fear;* that is, *heard favorably*, and hence *delivered from the object of his dread.* The Septuagint reads, "Save me from the lion's mouth; and my *low estate*, or *humiliated condition*, (ταπείνωσιν,) from the horns of the unicorns." Cf. the word Luke i, 48. This lowest point of Christ's suffering was called his *humiliation.* Acts viii, 33. "If any ask how this may be applied to Christ, whom the Father delivered not from death, I answer, that he was more mightily delivered than if the danger had been prevented, even so much as it is more to rise from death, than to be healed of a sore sickness. Wherefore death prevented not Christ's rising again from bearing witness at length that he was heard." *Calvin.*

The sufferer has now reached the vertex of his agony. He stands before the open mouth of the lion, and the threatening horns of the gaping wild bulls, (unicorns.) Instant death, or instant rescue, must follow. Nature can hold out no longer, and the imagination even stands breathless in suspense, watching the issue. At this point ends the first division of the Psalm. The destiny of the sufferer is decided. The absent Jehovah reveals himself. The hidden arm is "made bare," the withdrawn presence is restored. The next utterance of the Psalmist is the key-note of victory and gratitude, of brotherly confidence and fellowship. From the mouth of the lion he exclaims, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation (Church, Heb. ii, 12) will I praise thee." Ver. 22. Bishop Horsley would terminate the first strophe with *unicorns*, and begin the second with, *Thou hast heard me;* thus—

> Save me from the mouth of the lion,
> And from the horns of the unicorns.
> —Thou hast answered me!
> I will declare thy name, etc.

The transition is beautiful and highly impassioned. The remainder of the Psalm is taken up with descriptions of the deliverance and triumph of Christ, the joy which this event shall occasion to all the earth, the wonderful spread of the

Gospel among the nations, (ver. 27–29,) and the establishment of the true Church throughout all generations, (ver. 30-31.) We have not space for the remainder of this incomparable Psalm, on which it is not our object to write a general comment, but only to call attention to its wonderful agonistic utterances, on which our proposed argument depends.

Art. VII.—INSPIRATION OF ALL SCRIPTURE.

Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. 2 Tim. iii, 16.

The common rendering of this passage has been much disputed, and it is a grave question whether it can be textually or grammatically defended. An *ἐστί*, it is said, is understood. By this is meant, not a defective reading, or failure in the text, but an understood grammatical or idiomatic ellipsis. But is this substantive verb to be regarded as connected with *θεόπνευστος*, or with *ὠφέλιμος*? If with the former, it will give the common translation, (other difficulties being overlooked,) namely, "all Scripture is inspired," etc. If *ἐστί* is to be understood with *ὠφέλιμος*, then it would mean, "all inspired Scripture is also profitable," etc. *Θεόπνευστος* becomes, in this latter case, an attributive, and *ὠφέλιμος* a predicative adjective; or, in other words, the first belongs to the subject of the sentence. So Alford takes it, and Theodoret among the early commentators, together with some who are most eminent among the modern. The view is strongly favored by the nature and usage of the words. As connected with *θεόπνευστος*, such an ellipsis of *ἐστί* would be a very unusual thing. There is, on the other hand, a Greek idiom that almost always omits the copula *ἐστί* in the case of certain adjectives, which, from their frequent use in such connections, are regarded as having a verbal or predicative force rendering its expression unnecessary. They are such words as "*ἕτοιμος, ῥᾳδιουργός, αἴτιος, ῥᾴδιος, δυνατός, ἀγαθός*," etc.: *it (is) ready, it (is) easy, it (is) possible, it (is) good*, etc. The list may not be reducible to any precise or definite number, and *ὠφέλιμος* may not be found among them expressly mentioned

in any grammatical work, but it is of the same nature with the others mentioned, and, from its commonness, the very kind of word to be thus used, carrying with it a predicative force which supplies the ellipsis.* "All Scripture given by inspiration is also profitable," *καὶ ὠφέλιμος*; it is the *καὶ* intensive, and at the same time copulative and additional: "not only inspired, but also profitable." It is the assertive *καὶ*, commencing a declarative or predicative clause, but connecting it with the previous attributive epithet: "All inspired Scripture (besides being inspired) is *also* profitable," etc. It is, moreover, the *καὶ* inferential: "All inspired Scripture is *therefore* (besides being inspired, and as a consequence of its inspiration) profitable *also* for doctrine," etc. It may also be regarded as equivalent to *ἀλλὰ καί*, (see examples, Hoogeveen, KAI xvii,) or, *οὕτω καὶ*, as in Acts vii, 51, *ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς*, "as your fathers, so *also* you." Bloomfield says, that the interpretation thus brought out—namely, that which gives *θεόπνευστος* to the subject of the sentence—is not permitted by the *καί*. It would be more correct to say that it is demanded by it. To regard *καὶ* as merely copulative here, connecting simply the two epithets *θεόπνευστος* and *ὠφέλιμος*, would throw them both into the predicate: "All Scripture is inspired and useful," etc. Such a construction, besides stripping *καὶ* of all its illative force, would bring *θεόπνευστος*, as well as *ὠφέλιμος*, into a direct grammatical relation to *πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον*, etc. But this makes an awkward, and scarcely admissible, sense; though, on such hypothesis, grammatically unavoidable. To prevent it, the order of the words would have to be changed thus: *θεόπνευστος πᾶσα γραφὴ καὶ ὠφέλιμος προς. κ. τ. λ.*

In defense of the common interpretation, it is said that *πᾶσα γραφὴ* is only another expression for *ἱερὰ γράμματα* used just above, and which was the common term for the whole of Holy Scripture as embraced in the well-known Jewish canon. This is done to take away the universality which would, other-

* This construction is generally with a neuter or impersonal subject, or with the first person, as *θαυμαστὸν, it is wonderful*, *ἕτοιμος ἐγὼ, I am ready*, though sometimes otherwise occurring. The view above taken is, therefore, not deemed conclusive, though the usage would seem to furnish some reason for the omission of *ἐστί*, especially in the somewhat peculiar New Testament Greek. It cannot easily be explained in any other way, except, perhaps, as affected by the Hebrew or Syriac idiom, in which the copula or substantive verb is so largely omitted.

wise, make such a sense wholly inadmissible. For Paul, certainly, does not mean to say, "*all* scripture," or all writings whatever, without any limitation to the phrase. But γραφὴ in the singular, and without the article, is not thus used for the Jewish canonical Scriptures, as though the bare employment of it would exclude every other idea from the mind of the reader. When thus used for the Old Testament writings, it always has the article, and is most commonly in the plural. It would be ἡ γραφή, or *al* γραφαί, or it would read here, πᾶσα ἡ γαφὴ. If it be said that the article is omitted because θεόπνευστος, as a descriptive epithet, rendered it unnecessary, that could only be on the ground that θεόπνευστος is an attributive, and not a predicative, adjective. Should we mean to say, "All Scripture (meaning the Jewish canon) is inspired"—this would require the article: πᾶσα ἡ γραφὴ θεόπνευστος ἐστί. The other expression, "All inspired Scripture," does not need the article in Greek, because the attributive epithet, of itself, sufficiently limits and defines it.

All the ancient versions, as well as the best of the ancient interpretations, support this view. Thus the Vulgate has it: "*Omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est*,"—"All Scripture divinely inspired is profitable for teaching," etc. The Peschito Syriac gives the same sense, and can only be thus translated, "All Scripture that is written by the Spirit (or in the Spirit) profitable is the same for teaching, for reproving, for direction, for the education which is in righteousness."

The Philoxenian Syraic version is chiefly valuable on account of its close adherence to the Greek text. In this aspect, therefore, its translation is important, as showing, not only the state of the best and commonly received Greek text of that time, (A. D. about 600,) but also what was then regarded as the truest and most faithful interpretation of it. While differing much from the Peschito in the use of different words, it gives the same idea of the passage: "All Scripture *inbreathed from God* (following closely the Greek θεόπνευστος) is also profitable for instruction," etc. Its particle ܘ [ʷ] has the same inferential and epidotic force as the Greek καὶ—and *not only* inspired, but *also* profitable,"—or, "because inspired, *therefore* also profitable."

And this furnishes the answer to the objection that is commonly

presented: To say that "all inspired Scripture is profitable," etc., would seem, as viewed from our stand-point, like announcing a tame truism, useless, because no one would think of controverting it. But such objection comes from giving no force to the *καὶ*, or from regarding it as a mere copulative, and nothing more. It is illative, *αἰτιολογικόν*, giving a reason: "All inspired Scripture is, therefore, (on that very account or by reason of its being inspired,) profitable for teaching," etc.

This may be better seen by endeavoring to go back to the old stand-point. In modern times we agitate much the question of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, and it therefore comes strongly to us that this is the important truth asserted here. But that was not a question in Paul's time, either with himself or with the one to whom he writes. It was another truth he wishes to establish, namely, that every part of the Old Testament, the acknowledged *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, the Holy or Inspired Scripture mentioned above as known to Timothy, was profitable for doctrine, etc., and for this very reason, because it was inspired or God-given. Not one jot or tittle of it was given in vain. All of those Old Testament stories which Timothy had learned in his childhood (*ἀπὸ βρέφους*) from his mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois, were good and profitable for his ministry. Their inspiration was taken for granted on both sides. The story of Hagar, which Paul allegorizes—the blessing of Isaac—the details of the tabernacle and of the wilderness worship—were all profitable for instruction as well as the psalms or the prophecies, and, therefore, Timothy is encouraged to study them as he (Paul) had done.

So far as the other doctrine is concerned, (the doctrine of the true inspiration, now become the prominent one, and presenting the prominent question,) it is doubtless supported here, and all the more strongly, we think, from the fact of its being assumed as the unquestioned ground of something else—the direct assertion intended being the universality of the profitableness, rather than the universality of the inspiration of the *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, or Holy Scriptures. Their divine inspiration is admitted in the very use of the epithet. The phrase *Sacræ Scripturæ* has now lost much of its meaning and emphasis. The Neologist uses the term, in his flippant, conventional way, as well as the most devout believer. In the days

of the Apostle, *Sacred* Scripture meant writings inbreathed from God. To the Jew, not only, but to the early Christian, the term stood out in bold contradistinction from all earthly literature, regarded as profane in comparison with it. The other doctrine, of its universal profitableness, was the one then specially requiring to be insisted on. It is still demanded. There are those who admit the Scriptures to be inspired, some in a higher, some in a lower sense, but with the qualification that certain parts are antiquated, obsolete, of no use after Christianity appeared, or, at least, for this advanced and enlightened age. Such a view is more than hinted even in writings and speeches from modern Christians claiming to be evangelical. The fact shows that the interpretation for which we contend has not only its use, but is connected with the highest estimate we should form of the sacred writings.

That every part of inspired Scripture has its value, especially for the preacher, would seem, then, to be the doctrine taught in this passage. It is not meant that all has equal value, but that all is equally the Word of God, every part having its place necessarily in the one great message, or the one great and greatly varied system of communication through which God makes himself known in his special or remarkable, in distinction from his ordinary, acting in the world's history. This is the revelation itself, in distinction from the *writing*, which is the inspired or divinely guarded record of it. Or we may say that revelation, whether as act or history, is the exhibition of the supernatural in the world, but is not itself all supernatural. It is connected with common events as the medium of such exhibition. The natural is mingled with the supernatural, the ordinary with the extraordinary, the human with the divine, but all as forming sections and chapters of the one great narrative, regarded as a manifestation of God taking place concurrently, and in close connection, with the ordinary in nature, in history, in the souls, lives, and actions of men. Herein lies its truthfulness and consistency as a revelation for us. By such connection, however, of the lower elements with the higher, the former get a value and a dignity they would not otherwise possess. By such a marriage they are made holy, as it were, and the record of them, as parts of the great record, may be truly said to be inspired, though the history of

such subordinate parts may require no higher spiritual state, or spiritual faculties, than the knowledge, perceptions, and memories of truthful, holy men. To this end, as forming necessary links in the one unbroken narrative of redemption, or history of the kingdom of God in the world, the geography, the common recital of very common events, the proper names, even, with their often startling spiritual significance, have all a value—a high religious value—that would not belong to them out of such connection. It is thus they become parts of the one Divine Word, or manifestation of God in the world, and "profitable," beyond all similar events in human history, "for teaching, for conviction, for education in righteousness."

This view is well expressed by that profound Jewish critic and philosopher, Maimonides, in his Explication of the Tenth Chapter of the Talmudic Tract Sanhedrin: "It is the eighth foundation of faith that the law is from Heaven, and in this it is firmly held that *all* the law thus came down to Moses, and that all of it is from the mouth of the Almighty—that is, all of it came from God in that way which they metaphorically call the *word*. . . . And Moses wrote it all—all its chronologies, all its genealogies, all its stories, all its laws and precepts, and, therefore, was he called the scribe (Mehakkek); and (in this respect of its coming from God) there is no difference between such passages as these: '*And the sons of Ham were Cush and Mitsraim, and Phut and Canaan*,' and, '*The name of his wife was Mehitabel, the daughter of Mitzad*,' and such a one as this, '*I am the Lord*,' and '*Hear, O Israel, Jehovah thy God is one*.' All is from the mouth of the Mighty One, and it is all the law (or teaching) of the Lord, perfect, pure, holy, true. And so it was that Manasseh became worse than all the infidels in his unbelief and hypocrisy, on account of his holding that there was in the law heart (pith) and bark, (as of a tree,) and that these chronologies and stories had no utility in them, or that they were all from Moses himself."

In 2 Tim. iv, 13, Paul charges Timothy "to bring along with him the cloak which he had left with Karpus at Troas." It was the φαιλόνης, a thick outer garment used in traveling for protection against the weather, and which the Apostle may have highly valued, either from the associations of its

former use, or from present want in the cold prison with which he was then threatened. But what inspiration is there here? says the sneering Rationalist. What need of any thing more than the ordinary human faculties and desires in prompting or giving such a message? He mistakes the matter altogether. Not far behind him is the commentator of the M'Knight school, who would defend, or rather excuse, the passage as teaching economy and attention to details, which, they would apologizingly say, is not unworthy of divine direction. The spiritually-minded reader is not stumbled at the passage, even if he can see, or imagine, no connection with what may be deemed the higher teachings of the Epistle. If, however, he is deeply imbued with the spirit of revelation, this care of Paul for his phailonês*—his old and tattered cloak, it may be—will make him think of those most pathetic words, 2 Cor. xi, 27: "In labor and weariness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in *cold* and *nakedness*." It brings before the mind the lonely traveler with this old cloak wrapped about him as he climbs the snowy mountains of Pisidia, with their wild and dangerous passes, or lies upon the stormy deck during the nights when they were tossed "up and down in Adria," or finds its need on the bleak shores of Melita, where they had to sleep by kindled fires "on account of the driving *rain* and because of the *cold*." Whether he had left it at Troas many years before, when, after preaching until day dawning, he took his hurried land journey across the cape to meet the ship at Assos, (Acts xx, 13, 14,) or during some much later journey not mentioned in history, cannot easily be determined. In either view the mention of this want, simply and incidentally as it seems to be made, gives power and vividness, gives a more inspiring inspiration, we may say, to all his admonitions "to endure hardship (*κακοπαθεῖν*) as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." There is inspiration in the mention of this cloak as something belonging to one devoted to the highest idea that ever inspired the human soul, and for the sake of which we might well pardon much of the trifling of Romanism, had it, indeed, pre-

* Some few commentators would give it the sense of *satchel*, or sack for holding books. But this is a mere guess, having no extrinsic support, and inconsistent with its mention as something separate. It is not at all likely that he would tell him to bring along the book-case, and then add, the books and parchments, afterward

served to us so precious a relic. How near it comes to us! this common daily want of such a man—"*a man in Christ*," who was caught up to the third heavens and saw the vision of the Lord! Granted that such mention came in the ordinary course of the ordinary human faculties, still it was through inspiration; it may be maintained, as a single concrete portion of that one all-pervading, all-animating divine thought of which Paul's soul was ever full, whether in speaking of the incidents of his painful journeyings or in the utterance of ideas so new to the world, so far above the developments of any former ethics or philosophy, and which, even now, Rationalists like Strauss, Colenso, and Renan utterly fail to comprehend.

And so we may say here, as Maimonides says in respect to the incidental narrations of the older Scripture: It is all the word of God, and in this respect of its divine sanction and authorship there is no difference between such a passage as that upon which we have been dwelling, "Bring with thee the cloak that I left behind in Troas, with the books, and especially the parchments" or such a one as this, "Prophecies shall come to an end, tongues shall cease, knowledge shall be found unsatisfying, but LOVE never faileth. For now we see in a mirror shadowly, but then face to face; now I know in in part, then shall I know even as I am known. Yet still endure (here and forever) faith, hope, and love—these three—but the greatest of these is LOVE." It was this divine love ever ruling in the owner's soul that rendered the cloak, the books, the parchments belonging to him, worthy objects of inspired mention; it was this that sanctified them, lifted them out of the common sphere of profane or worldly things, and made them all HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

Other examples might be given, affording similar illustrations; but the use of this, though regarded as one of the least of all, and so frequently cited as an *offendiculum* by the Rationalist, is enough to show that "all Scripture inbreathed from God is also profitable for doctrine, for conviction, for direction, for education in righteousness."

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

The Reconstruction of the Anglican Church in Ireland.—The separation between the Anglican Church in Ireland and the State government compelled the former to undertake a reconstruction upon a voluntary basis. The General Synod of the Irish Church, a union of the two Provincial Synods of Dublin and Armagh, met on Sept. 14 at Dublin. It was the first Synod held in Ireland since 1713. The Provincial Synod of Armagh had met a few days previously, but that of Dublin had to be formally constituted prior to the union of the two into one General Synod. In the Upper House the Primate (the Archbishop of Armagh) presided; the Lower House elected the Rev. Dr. West, Dean of St. Patrick's and Christ Church, its Prolocutor. A protest against the disestablishment of the Church was adopted by the Lower House unanimously, while in the Upper House the Bishop of Down objected to it as unnecessary. As to finance, all parties seem to be agreed that the remainder of the old possessions of the Church, which may be retained, will require to be largely supplemented by private liberality if the Church is to be made efficient. In the matter of government, the Synod adopted a "scheme for the reform of the Provincial Synods, with a view to a union of the Bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church of Ireland in General Synod." It proposed that the clergy of each diocese should meet in a Diocesan Synod, and elect a certain number of their brethren to represent them in a General Synod, with whom were to be included one Dean and one Archdeacon for each diocese, who, with certain officers of Trinity College, Dublin, were to sit *ex officio*. The latter part of the scheme excited much discussion, and an amendment proposed by the Dean of Cashel, omitting the *ex officio* members, was carried, after an earnest debate, by 107 to 29. It was also unanimously agreed that all parochial clergy, whether beneficed or not, should be entitled to vote for clerical representatives, and that the representation should be in the proportion of one to ten in the clergy These amendments were accepted by the Lower House.

In October there was a three days' Conference of lay delegates of the Irish Church in Dublin. The Duke of Abercorn presided, and some four hundred delegates were present, including a number of noblemen, members of Parliament, and other influential and wealthy members of the Irish Church. One of the resolutions adopted was to the effect that the clerical and lay representatives should sit and discuss all questions together in the General Synod, with the right to vote by orders if demanded by three of either order at the meeting. It was explained that this recommendation of the Conference was not to apply to Diocesan Synods, but to the General Convention which is to be afterward formed. On the question of the relative proportions of the representatives of the dioceses, and also of the clergy and the laity, a resolution was adopted that the number of lay representatives for the respective dioceses should be partly based on population, and partly on the old parochial system. As regards the proportion of clergy to laity, the following resolution was carried by an overwhelming majority: "That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is expedient that the number of lay representatives in the General Synod should be to the clerical in proportion of two to one." The clergy also had a private meeting in October, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Dublin, at which it was resolved by a large majority that the laity should have a common right with the clergy to decide on matters of doctrine and discipline in the future councils of the Church.

At a meeting of the Bishops, held in November, it was resolved to sit and vote as a separate order when they deem proper, or in other words, to have the power of vetoing any proposal with which they disagree. The majority of the laity seem to be any thing but pleased with this resolution. Another meeting of lay delegates was held at Armagh, presided over by Lord Rosse, at which it was moved by Lord Dunalley, and agreed to, that the meeting greatly regretted the resolution of the bishops.

and understood "voting by order" to mean that a majority of bishops and clergy together, and a majority of lay representatives, should be sufficient to pass any motion. The meeting also strongly protested against the bishops having the power of a veto in diocesan synods. Thus a serious conflict begins to arise between the High Church and the Presbyterian element in the Church.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL.—During the latter part of the year 1869 no important manifestations have taken place with regard to the Council outside of the Roman Catholic Church. The Bishops of the Eastern Churches, after declining the Pope's invitation, have observed an absolute silence. The hope of seeing a number of them attend had been abandoned even in Rome. Even the most sanguine among the champions of Rome did not expect more than two or three of them to be present.

In the Protestant world, several more prominent bodies have taken notice of the Papal invitation. In the United States the Moderators of the two largest bodies among the Presbyterians have sent a joint letter to the Pope, restating, in brief and mild words, the great doctrinal differences which separate the Roman Catholic from the Protestant branch of Christianity. In Germany, the Church Diet and several other societies have passed resolutions, explaining why there can be no hope of a reunion of the Protestant denominations and of Roman Catholicism, as long as the Pope occupies his anti-scriptural position.

Dr. Cumming, of London, has called forth a letter of the Pope, not to himself, but to Archbishop Manning, of Westminster, in which the permission asked for by the Doctor, to plead the cause of Evangelical Protestantism in the assembly of Rome, is refused. A second letter of the Pope, however, informs the Archbishop that any Protestants who may wish to discuss the points of difference between them and the Roman Catholic Church, may come to Rome, and that theologians will be appointed by the Pope, with whom they may confer. The only body outside of the Roman Catholic Church which contains members who may go to Rome in pursuance of the Pope's invitation are the High Church Anglicans. Reports from Rome state that already a learned Church historian of France, Abbé Freppel, had been appointed to treat with the Anglicans.

Within the Catholic Church the opposition to the ultramontane tendencies which animate the Pope and his counselors, and will control the majority of the coming Council, has developed a much greater strength than was originally expected. An extraordinary sensation was produced not only within the Roman Catholic Church, but throughout the Christian world, by a sharp letter from one of the greatest pulpit orators of the Church, Father Hyacinthe, against the ultramontane tendencies. Father Hyacinthe, belonging to a family of the name of Loison, has been for many years a monk of the Order of Barefooted Carmelites. His fame as a preacher having attracted the attention of the present liberal Archbishop of Paris, he was several years appointed to preach the Advent course of sermons in Notre Dame, the Lent course being reserved for the representative of the opposite school of the Church—the Jesuit, Père Felix. His sermons, which were entirely extempore, ran chiefly on general topics, such as "Society," "Education," "The Family," "The Church," and attracted general attention, not only by the unusual eloquence with which they were delivered, but by remarkable liberality, which he manifested toward the Christian communities outside the Catholic pale as parts of Christendom. In many quarters his liberalism created a great uneasiness; and when, at a Peace Congress held in Paris, in 1869, he spoke in kindly appreciation of Protestants and Jews, he drew upon him a sharp rebuke from his superior, the General of the Carmelite Order. This led him to announce to the Archbishop of Paris the impossibility of his preaching again at Notre Dame, and soon afterward followed his famous letter to the General of his Order, in which he utters a bold protest against the tendencies prevailing in Rome, and renounces his monastic obedience. The effect of the letter was like a bombshell. Father Hyacinthe himself escaped from the trials of alternate applause and invective to which his stay in Paris, or even in Europe, would have exposed him, by a retirement to America. Most of the Liberal Catholics of France—the party of Montalembert, Albert de Brog-

lie, and the *Correspondant*—were sorely tried by this unexpected move, which they censured as too rash and as extreme, saying that he would have served their cause better by remaining in his place, preaching whatever he would have to say from the pulpit of Notre Dame, and leaving the authorities to dispose of him as best they could. Still his protest did not remain alone. While Father Hyacinthe felt himself bound to protest against the Council from the stand-point of a common Christianity, another sharp protest was issued in the name of the old Gallican school by one of the French Bishops. Monseigneur Maret, Bishop of Sura, (*in partibus infidelium,*) and Dean of the Theological Faculty of Paris. Bishop Maret has written two volumes "On the General Council and the Public Peace," which he submits to the Council. More are to follow, but these may suffice as to the general tendency. In a circular letter to his brother Bishops he refers them to the preface of the book, written, he says, in the exercise of an episcopal right, and inspired by love to the Church and the Holy See. He has dedicated these two volumes to the Pope himself. In the letter addressed to His Holiness he writes first to excuse himself that he cannot himself be the bearer of his work, inspired, he repeats also to him, by his episcopal duty. "At the moment of the assembling of an Œcumenical Council," he proceeds, "which is called upon to perform such great tasks, and foreseeing, as I do, the sinister consequences wherewith projects might be fraught, conceived and proclaimed by venerable men who, however, do not seem fully aware of the perils of their undertaking—it appears to me both useful and necessary to draw the picture of the constitution of the Church in its greatness and perfection, and in that unchanging character which its Divine Founder intended to impart to it." He has published this book, he says, so that all may read it—the Pope, the Bishops, the priests, the people, clerics as well as laymen. "I publish them before the Council, so that they all *may have time* to read them." Briefly, the whole work, from beginning to end, is devoted to one object—to the most fervent and unsparing fight against the dogma of the Papal infallibility and to the defense of Gallicanism. "In professing all the respect due to the decisions and bulls of Sixtus IV., Alexander VIII., Clement XI., Pius IV., we adhere to doctrines which appear to us true."

The substance of the argument is as follows:

According to the Holy Scriptures the Church is a limited monarchy, which stands under the common rule of the Pope and the Bishops. The history of the Councils is at least as much in favor of the divine right of the Bishops as of the supremacy of the Holy Chair. Freedom of discussion, vote by majority, a juridical examination of the apostolic decrees, and, in certain cases, a right to condemn the doctrines and the person of the Pope—these are rights which prove beyond all doubt the participation of the Bishops in the sovereign powers of the Holy Father. But these rights do not extend far enough to give the episcopal body a supremacy over the Pope, and the latter therefore exercises, in general, all the privileges of supremacy. He summons the Council, presides over it, dissolves it, and sanctions its decrees. In a word, he always remains the head of the Church. If, however, the changes desired by a certain school are made, the Church will cease to be a limited, and become an absolute monarchy. This would be a complete revolution; but what is truly divine is unchangeable, and, consequently, if the constitution of the Church is changed, it ceases to be divine. Pius IX., in his bull, *Ineffabilis Deus*, has himself said of doctrine, *Crescat in eodem sensu, in eadem sententia;* but the new dogma would lead to a development of doctrine *in alio sensu, in alia sententia.* It would therefore amount to a denial of the divinity of the Church. "If it were realized," exclaims the Bishop, "what a triumph would it be to the enemies of the Church. They would call the asseverations of centuries, and history itself, as witnesses against Catholicism: she would be crushed by the weight of opposing testimony; the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, and the Councils would rise in judgment against her. They would bury us in our shame, and, from the desert, atheism would rise more powerful and threatening than ever."—Vol. II, p. 378.

A number of the French Bishops have already openly declared against the work of their colleague, and few prominent men in the Church dare to be as outspoken as he. But very large is the party, even among the Bishops, who, though in a very moderate language, do not conceal that they disapprove of the clamor of the ultramontane party for a promulgation of the Papal infallibility as a doctrine of the Church. By far the most

important manifestation of this kind is the pastoral letter issued by the assembly of nineteen German Bishops at Fulda. They wish to remind the faithful of their dioceses that

Never and never shall or can a General Council establish a dogma not contained in Scripture or in the Apostolical Traditions. . . . Never and never shall or can a General Council proclaim doctrines in contradiction to the principles of justice, to the right of the State and its authorities to culture (*Gesittung*) and the true interests of science, (*Wissenschaft*,) or to the legitimate freedom and well-being of nations. . . . Neither need any one fear that the General Council will thoughtlessly and hastily frame resolutions which needlessly would put it in antagonism to existing circumstances, and to the wants of the present times; or that it would, in the manner of enthusiasts, endeavor to transplant into the present times views, enstoms, and institutions of times gone by."

In reply to the insinuation that there would not be the fullest liberty of debate, they say:

The Bishops of the Catholic Church will never and never forget at the General Council, on this most important occasion of their office and calling, the holiest of their duties, the duty of bearing testimony to truth; they will, remembering the Apostolic vow, that he who desires to please men is not the servant of Christ—remembering the account which they will soon have to give before the throne of the Divine Judge—know no other line of conduct but that dictated by their faith and their conscience.

All these words, like the whole of the letter, are, with admirable skill, so framed as to avoid any direct assertion that would give offense in Rome; but both parties—the ultra-montane as well as their opponents—feel that the language of the German Bishops is very different from that of the spokesmen of the Papal infallibility. The declaration of the German Bishops is the more important as—with the exception of the Jesuits and a few of their friends—it has been received by the scholars, the press, and the intelligent laity with great joy as a momentous testimony against an opinion which, among the Catholics of Germany, is extremely unpopular. The example of the German Bishops has been followed by similar letters of several prominent French Bishops, among whom are Archbishop Darboy, of Paris, and Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans. Both these prelates clearly indicate their personal aversion to the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope.

Cable dispatches inform us that the council was duly opened by the Pope on the eighth of December. The solemnities are, of course, said to be of extraordinary brilliancy. The Pope delivered an allocution, of the contents of which the cable gives us a very vague idea. It is reported that about seven hundred bishops attended the opening of the Council. This, if correct, would be a large number, for, according to the official Papal Almanac, the total number of cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops entitled to a seat in the Council amounted in 1869 to about one thousand. The numerous American element in the Council is especially notable. While at the last Œcumenical Council, that of Trent, the new world, only recently discovered, was not yet represented by a single prelate, now the American bishops, numbering in all one hundred and sixty-seven, would constitute almost one fifth of the entire hierarchy. Among them there are seven archbishops from the United States, three from British America, three from Mexico, one each from Cuba, San Domingo, Hayti, Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Chili, Peru, Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Brazil.

None of the secular powers was represented at the opening of the Council by an official representative. All of the Catholic State governments are known to be entirely at variance with the tendencies prevailing in Rome, and which it is expected may lead to the promulgation of Papal infallibility as a doctrine of the Church. Most of them have clearly intimated that if the Council should promulgate such doctrine, or pass resolutions contrary to the rights claimed by the State government, it will lead to a radical change in the present relations between Church and State.

Soon after its meeting the sessions of the Council were adjourned until after Epiphany. Of the disposition of the Bishops little is yet known, except that the German and French Bishops mean to offer a determined opposition to the doctrine of the Papal infallibility.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

THE INTERCOMMUNION QUESTION. — One of the most important letters which has recently been published is one from

the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in reply to one written by his Grace (of Canterbury) to his Holiness, (of Constantinople,) forwarding, as appears from this reply, a copy of the English prayer book. The Patriarch's letter is dated September 26. 1869, and concludes as follows:

On descending to the particulars of the contents of the prayer book, and of the distinguished confession of the thirty-nine articles contained in it—since in the perusal of them, both the statements concerning the eternal existence of the Holy Spirit and those concerning the divine eucharist, and further, those concerning the number of the sacraments, concerning apostolic and ecclesiastical tradition, the authority of the truly genuine Œcumenical Councils, the position and mutual relations of the Church on earth and that in heaven; and, moreover, the honor and reverence due from us to those who are in theory and practice the heroes of the faith—the adamantine martyrs and athletes—since, we say, these statements appeared to us to savor too much of novelty; and that which is said, (p. 592, Art. 19,) "As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith," deprives the Eastern Churches of the orthodoxy and perfection of the faith—let us be permitted to say that accusations of our neighbors are out of place in a distinguished confession of faith—these statements throw us into suspense, so that we doubt what we are to judge of the rule of Anglican orthodoxy. We would, therefore, pray with our whole soul to the Author and Finisher of our salvation to enlighten the understanding of all with the light of his knowledge, and to make of all nations one speech of the one faith, and of the one love, and of the one hope of the Gospel; that with one mouth and one heart, as merciful children of one and the same mother, the Church—the Catholic Church of the first begotten—we may glorify the triune God.

The High Church party in the Anglican Church are elated with the letter, which they regard as the most important missive received by an Archbishop of Canterbury from an Oriental Patriarch. As a step toward a reunion of the Eastern to the Anglican Churches, it is considered a most valuable and important event, not the less so because the Patriarch points out, in definite language, the obstacles that hinder, or seem to hinder, intercommunion. The Patriarch's criticism on the Nineteenth Article ["As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred"] is declared to be natural and deserved, since indeed, as the Patriarch says, "accusations of our neighbor are out of place in a distinguished confession of faith." The *Church News*, an organ of the Ritualists, assures the Patriarch that "the great majority of really devout and loyal Anglican Churchmen, clergy and laity, would not regret a modification of that Article, so as to remove the obstacle altogether with regard to the East."

Among the manuscripts left by the celebrated Dr. Rothe was one containing a "System of Christian Doctrines," ready for the press. The work will be published by Dr. Schenkel. The first part, which is entitled, The Consciousness of Sin, has just appeared. The second and third parts, which are to complete the work, will appear in the course of the year 1870.

A "History of the Religious Sects of the Middle Ages," from the pen of Professor Döllinger in Munich, is announced as forthcoming. (Geschichte der Religiösen Sekten des Mittelalters.) It will contain two volumes. Professor Döllinger, who, as a Church historian, has no superior in the Roman Catholic Church, has also prepared a strong pamphlet against the infallibility of the Pope, and sent a copy of it to every Bishop of Catholic Germany.

Dr. Hefele, hitherto Professor of Catholic Theology at Tübingen, and now Bishop elect of Rottenburg, has published the first part of the seventh volume of his great work on the History of the Councils, containing the History of the Council of Constance, (*Conciliengeschichte.* Freiburg, 1869.)

One of the great Protestant Bible works of Germany, the Commentary of Meyer to the New Testament, has just been completed in a new edition by the appearance of the fifth edition of the Commentary of the Gospel according to John. This work was begun thirty-seven years ago by H. A. W. Meyer, and has been continued by Dr. Lünemann, Dr. Huther, and Dr. Diesterdieck, all of whom enjoy a great reputation as exegetical writers of great ability. Though of late this work has been eclipsed by the Bible work of Lange, which embraces within its scope a commentary to the Old as well as the New

Testament, and which, in the greatly improved shape which the English translation has received from the hands of Professor Schaff, has had in England and America an even larger circulation than in Germany, the commentary of Dr. Meyer has, by general consent, secured forever a conspicuous place among the many great works of German theology.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The Roman Council has called forth an immense literature. The fourth number of a German periodical, specially devoted to the Council, carries the number of books on the Council, which it has reviewed, up to 57, and its list does not yet contain one half the total number. The great scholars of the Roman Catholic Church are almost unanimous in opposing very earnestly the Papal tendencies now prevailing in the Church, and particularly the proposed promulgation of the doctrine of Papal infallibility. The ablest work in this respect is on "The Pope and the Council," (*The Papst 'und das Concil,*) the author of which styles himself Janus. The work has made a profound sensation. It is so manifestly a work of immense scholarship that at first some ascribed it to the celebrated Dollinger. This, however, proved to be an error, and another professor of the University of Munich, Professor Huber, is now generally regarded as the author. The work is a history of the authority possessed in the Church by the Pope on the one hand and the Council on the other, and the relation of the two to each other. Even the champions of ultramontane views must admit that they are unable to answer the book, because it would take years to study the thousands of individual cases which the author cites to show that no one can for a moment believe in this doctrine without falsifying the whole history of the Church. "For thirteen centuries," says our author, "an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the Pope, still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him." Not a single question of doctrine for the first thousand years was finally decided by the Popes; in none of the early controversies did they take any part at all; and their interposition, when they began to interpose, was often far from felicitous. Pope Zosimus commended the Pelagian teaching of Celestius, Pope Julian affirmed the orthodoxy of the Sabellian Marcellus of Ancyra, Pope Liberius subscribed an Arian creed, Pope Vigilius contradicted himself three times running on a question of faith, Pope Honorius lent the whole weight of his authority to the support of the newly-introduced Monothelite heresy, and was solemnly anathematized by three Œcumenical Councils for doing so. Nor do these "errors and contradictions of the Popes" grow by any means fewer or less important as time goes on; but for further examples we must refer our readers to the book itself. The blundering of successive Popes about the conditions of valid ordination—on which, according to Catholic theology, the whole sacramental system, and therefore the means of salvation, depend—are alone sufficient to dispose forever of their claim to infallibility. Neither, again, did the Roman Pontiffs possess, in the ancient constitution of the Church, any of those powers which are now held to be inherent in their sovereign office, and which must undoubtedly be reckoned among the essential attributes of absolute sovereignty. They convoked none of the General Councils, and only presided, by their legates, at three of them, nor were the canons enacted there held to require their confirmation. They had neither legislative, administrative, nor judicial power in the Church, nor was any further efficacy attributed to their excommunication than to that of any other Bishop. No special prerogatives were held to have been bequeathed to them by Saint Peter, and the only duty con-

sidered to devolve on them in virtue of their primacy was that of watching over the observance of the canons. The limited right of hearing appeals, granted to them by the Council of Sardica in 347, was avowedly an innovation, of purely ecclesiastical origin, and moreover was never admitted or exercised in Africa or the East. Many national Churches, like the Armenian, the Syro-Persian, the Irish, and the ancient British, were independent of any influence of Rome. When first something like the Papal system was put into words by an Eastern Patriarch, St. Gregory, the greatest and best of all the early Popes, repudiated the idea as a wicked blasphemy. Not one of the Fathers explains the passages of the New Testament about St. Peter in the ultramontane sense; and the Tridentine profession of faith binds all the clergy to interpret Scripture in accordance with their unanimous consent. "To prove the doctrine of Papal infallibility nothing less is required than a complete falsification of Church history." An overwhelming mass of evidence against the infallibility of the Pope is collected in the work before us. The chapters on "Forgeries," "Encroachments," "Interdicts," "The Inquisition," "The Cardinals," and "The Curia," contain the pith of the story. The edifice, based on a huge substructure of forgeries, was gradually reared through the patient toil of centuries of chicanery and violence—each weapon being employed in turn, as occasion served, with a persistent cruelty and cunning which it would be difficult to parallel in history—till it now only awaits its final consummation, when the darling dream of the infallibilists shall have been erected by the approaching Council into an article of faith.

Art. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

Baptist Quarterly, October, 1869. (Philadelphia.)—1. University Corporations 2. F. W. Robertson on Baptismal Regeneration. 3. Growth and History of Language. 4. Mr. Lowell's Poetry. 5. Balaam, the Prophet of Syria. 6. Exegetical Studies.

Bibliotheca Sacra, October, 1869. (Andover.)—1. The Resurrection of the Body. 2. The Natural Theology of Social Science. 3. The Königsberg Religious Suit. 4. Mount Lebanon. 5. The Doctrine of the Apostles. 6. The Brethren of our Lord. 7. Rival Editions of the Text of the New Testament as contained in the Codex Vaticanus.

Christian Quarterly, October, 1869. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Church of the Future. 2. Life and Times of Alexander Campbell. 3. Ancient Hymnody. 4. Œcumenical Councils. 5. Women's Work in the Church. 6. Jerusalem.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, October, 1869. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Justification by Faith. Article Fourth of the Augsburg Confession. 2. The Sabbath Question in its Historical Relations, and Bearings upon the Faith and Life of the Church. 3. Communion with God. 4. Ecclesiastical Purity. 5. Daniel and his Prophecies. 6. The Relation of the Text to the Sermon. By Dr. Kahle, Pastor at Caymen. Translated from the German. 7. Patrick Henry.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, July, 1869. (Dover, N. H.)—1. The Divine Prerogative to Save and to Destroy. 2. The First Resurrection. 3. Christ's Exaltation and Universal Drawing. 4. Rationalism. 5. The Doctrine of God's Special Providence. 6. Christianity a Mission Work. 7. The Doctrine of Paul and James on Faith and Works, compared with the Teachings of Christ. 8. God's Way of Salvation. 9. Impediments to Self-Knowledge.

Mercersburg Review, October, 1869. (Philadelphia.)—1. The True Idea of Liberal Education. 2. Image and Likeness. 3. Priestly Mediation. 4. The

Relation of the Present to the Past and to the Future. 5. The Church of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth. 6. The Liturgical Movement in the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches.

NEW ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER, October, 1869, (Boston.)—1. Hon. Calvin Fletcher. 2. Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Portsmouth, N. H., 1706–1742. 3. Miss Frances Manwaring Caulkins. 4. The Spooner Family. 5. The Usher Family. 6. Emery—Amory. 7. Philip Welch, of Ipswich, Mass. 8. Epitaphs from "Burying Hill," Weymouth, Mass. 9. Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Lyme, Conn. 10. Papers relating to the Haines Family. 11. Church Records of Newington, N. H. 12. First Record-Book of First Church, Charlestown, Mass. 13. Milton (MS.) Church Records, 1678–1754. 14. Letters from Joshua Henshaw, Jr., to William Henshaw. 15. Documents relating to the Colonial History of Connecticut, with Notes. 16. Bibliography of the Local History of Massachusetts.

PRINCETON REVIEW, October, 1869. (New York.)—1. Morrell on Revelation and Inspiration. 2. Christian Work in Upper Egypt. 3. Recent Scholarship. 4. The Church Question. 5. Smaller Bodies of American Presbyterians. 6. Recent Discussions on the Representation of Minorities. 7. Oberlin Ethics and Theology; their Latest Exposition. 8. Materialism.—Physiological Psychology.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, October, 1869. (Boston.)—1. Hindu Philosophy and the Bhagavad-Gita. 2. The Pacific Railroad. 3. John Murray. 4. Religion and Science. 5. The Huguenots. 6. The Province and Uses of Ecclesiastical History.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, October, 1869. (Boston.)—1. The Genesis of Language. 2. The Writings of Mr. Rowland G. Hazard. 3. Indian Migrations. 4. Civil-Service Reform. 5. The Coast of Egypt and the Suez Canal. 6. Paraguay and the Present War.

In the first article Mr. Fiske says: "*Wo-man* is identical with Lat. *fe-min-a*, Skr. *we-man*, a 'weaver;' with which may be compared our use of *spinster*. It was hardly more strange that the primitive Aryans should call the woman a 'weaver,' than that they should call the *daughter* of the household a 'milkmaid;' yet this derivation of the latter word has been minutely and incontrovertibly proven."

Is not *fe-min-a* plainly the feminine form of *homo*, (Gen. *homin-is*,) being the word *man* preceded by the article, and succeeded by the sex termination?

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1869. (London.)—1. Lightfoot on the Epistle to the Philippians. 2. Hugh Broughton. 3. Pilate and his Times viewed by Indian Light. 4. The English New Testament—Revision and Retranslation. 5. Curiosities of Later Biography—Crabb Robinson and W. Savage Landor. 6. "The Song of Songs"—A New Reading of its Plot. 7. Kennedy on Mau's Relations to God. 8. The Philosophy of Nescience; or, Hamilton and Mansel on Religious Thought.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, October, 1869. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Juventus Mundi. 2. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew. 3. The Different Schools of Elementary Logic. 4. Mr. Browning's Latest Poetry. 5. The Pope and the Council. 6. The Constitutional Development of Austria. 7. Literature of the Land Question in Ireland.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1869. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Quakers. 2. The Poems and Prose Remains of Arthur Hugh Clough. 3. Water Supply of London. 4. Sunday Liberty. 5. The Afghan Tribes on our Trans-Indus Frontier. 6. The Natural History of Morals. 7. The Albert Life Insurance Company. 8. Compulsory Education. 9. Prostitution; its Sanitary Superintendence by the State.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1869. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street, N. Y.) 1. The Œcumenical Council. 2. Freshfield's Travels in the Caucasus. 3. The Duc d'Aumale's Lives of the Condés. 4. Thornton on Labor. 5. Count Bismarck. 6. Robinson's Parks and Gardens of Paris. 7. Fergusson on Tree and Serpent Worship. 8. Diaries of Henry Crabb Robinson. 9. Indian Judges, British and Native. 10. The Victorial of Don Pedro Nino. 11. Mill on the Subjection of Women.

The eleventh article is an ample (though it might have been ampler) refutation of Mr. Mills's fallacious book, The Subjection of Women. That Mr. Mills's work is one-sided, overdrawing the subjection of women, and overlooking the immense "subjection of men," both in the battle of history and in the marital relation, is clearly and conclusively shown. That volume, we think, possesses slight value in the discussion.

The equality of men and women, as maintained by Mills, is shown to be unreal. "If they are precisely the same kind of beings with no differences except those which are physical, then we allow without a moment's hesitation that women are the natural inferiors of men. Equality must embrace the whole being; it cannot be taken as belonging only to a part of it. And woman is confessedly and unmistakably man's inferior in one part of her being; therefore, unless she is as unmistakably his superior in another, she can have no claim to consider herself his equal. Now it cannot be asserted for an instant that she is notably his superior in intellect; all that the boldest theorizer ever dreams of asserting is, that she is equal with him in that particular, while she is manifestly not equal to him in bodily strength and personal courage. Thus in every way in which we can put the comparison, so long as we examine the two as competitors for one prize, her inferiority is marked and undeniable." The writer might just as easily have shown man's greater strength of intellect in every department of great thought as his greater strength of body. Divide all the great productions of human intellect into three grades of high, higher, highest, and the feminine productions will be a minority in the first, a rarity in the second, a non-existence in the third. The highest score, respectively, of mathematicians, poets, orators, historians, painters, architects, generals, and statesmen, we venture to say were all males. Beyond all reasonable question, then, to the male belongs the greater strength of intellect as clearly as the greater strength of body.

But is strength the only excellence? If men's advantage is *strength*, woman's is *beauty*, and all its powerful cognates; and if it be asked which is the superior excellence, strength or beauty, we reply that they are as incommensurable as a rod and a pound. Each excellence as exemplified in man and woman works for each sex a thousand reciprocal superiorities in turn. If woman is maritally a slave, so is man, perhaps, much more a slave. The duties of his family mastership often render him immensely the more worn and weary of the two. Take our high civilization and compare the life-task of a New York merchant with that of his fashionable wife!

And as for the proud dominion which, in its turn, feminine beauty overrides man, take the following case. We are conversing, in a New York watering-place, with a California lady who has read Mill, and is declaiming against the subjection of women. We reply: Madam, you are here living in a magnificent edifice built, owned, and managed exclusively by men, and yet your expenses being paid from a man's toils, you live a queen. When you depart, a carriage built by men and driven by men will convey you, with the most delicate care and reverence, to the depot. From the depot, designed by male brains, and built by hard male hands, you will be most respectfully transferred to the rail-car. Rail-car and railroad are built exclusively by male brain and muscle. While riding in it you are still a queen. Every voice softens in addressing you, and no hand dare touch you but with reverence. By car and by steamer, in the same queenly style, you enter San Francisco, a city built by men. In this queenly superiority you permanently reign through life; it is an organic reality, an imperative law laid upon subjected man by the power of Christianity and our modern civilization. For all this you repay men by simply *being what you are*, a beauty and a civilization to the race. Such is the subjection of men.

As to married woman's competence to enter into professional competition with man the negative argument is conclusive. As a woman, wife, and mother, she must pass through a variety of weakening periods that, for the twenty years that form the central period of man's manhood, entirely distance her in the race. A married woman can seldom be a permanent and successful general, statesman, or lawyer.

All this, however, fails to touch the question whether she ought not to possess some share of the power of choosing her own rulers, or whether government would not be better if the feminine side of the race had its proportion of power in molding

it. Woman may be unfit to rule, and yet be fit to select her rulers.

British Quarterly Review, (October, 1869.)—1. National Education in Ireland. 2. Crabb Robinson's Diary. 3. Nottingham. 4. Pre-Historic England. 5. The Works of Tourgeneff. 6. Thornton on Labor. 7. Skepticism in Excelsis. 8. The Later Life of De Foe. 9. The Hundredth Number of the "British Quarterly."

The fourth article in this quarterly (the organ of the English Independents) is an interesting dissertation of the ancient remains at Abury, and the celebrated *Stonehenge* on Salisbury Plain, England. These are fragments of immense masonry of hitherto unknown origin and antiquity, but usually considered to be temples of the old Druids. By comparison, however, with similar remains in other parts of the world, it is conjectured that they are invested with a much higher antiquity. The masonry is of a somewhat advanced order; the stones are so immense as to presuppose gigantic strength or powerful machinery; the stones are selected with great skill, and, huge as they are, drawn from some unknown place—certainly from no near quarry. There are indications that the builders were not idolators, but pure theists. The article closes as follows:

> Even as we write, the announcement of the discovery, in the South of France, of the relics of a gigantic race of *quasi* human beings, marked by osteological peculiarities hitherto undreamed of, has been made with such precision as to attract the attention of the French *Institut*, and M. Lartet has been commissioned to ascertain and report on the facts. There is much to lead to the belief that we are about to witness the opening of a hitherto unread chapter in the history of our predecessors in the dominion of the planet Earth.

London Quarterly Review, October, 1869. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Islam. 2. Isaac Barrow. 3. Higher and Lower Animals. 4. The Byron Mystery. 5. The Water Supply of London. 6. Lord Lytton's Horace. 7. The Reconstruction of the Irish Church. 8. Sacerdotal Celibacy. 9. The Past and the Future of Conservative Policy.

The argument in defense of Byron against the charge of incest appears, we are glad to say, as it now stands, conclusive. The sole basis of the charge is Lady Byron's own statement, which is precisely neutralized by Lady Augusta Leigh's own accepted purity of character. Then as exculpatory facts we have, 1. Lady Byron's own statement, through her own authorized spokesmen, that incest was not among the charges she had to bring; 2. Lady Byron's long subsequent intimate friendship with Mrs. Leigh; and, 3. Lady Byron's known peculiarity, in spite of her great active benevolence, of taking sudden and irrevocable piques against her former favorites.

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) 1870. First Number. *Essays:* 1. BEYSCHLAG, The "Vision-Theory," and its most Recent Defense. 2. KOSTLIN, Religion and Morality in their Relation to Each Other. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. CROPP, The Pericope on the Cananean Woman. 2. LAURENT, The Results of Tischendorf's Imitation of the Alexandrine Manuscript of Clement of Rome. 3. FRIEDLANDER, A Picture of the Saviour from Constantinople. *Reviews:* 1. MUCKE's "Dogmatik des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts" reviewed by BECK. 2. KLOSTERMANN's Untersuchungen zur alttestament. Theologie, reviewed by Riehm.

The reality of the resurrection of Christ has recently been, in Germany, the subject of an animated controversy. The rationalistic theologians, who deny the existence, and even the possibility, of miracles, have tried three different methods to explain away the reality of the resurrection of Christ. Either after the precedent of Reimarus, the author of the Wolfenbuttel Fragments, the whole narrative was declared to be a fraud, by means of a secret removal of the corpse by the disciples; or the death of Jesus was maintained to have been merely apparent, and his reappearance therefore an entirely natural event; or the reappearance of the risen Christ was finally explained as a vision, produced by the nervous excitement of the disciples. The first two of these explanations have found no keener opponent than Dr. Strauss, and have since had hardly any champion of note, and the present rationalists mostly adhere to the last-named method, the "vision theory." The fullest defense which has yet been presented of it is to be found in a work by Dr. Carl Holsten, entitled *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, (Rostock, 1868.) The author had, as long as seven years ago, defended this theory in an article of the "*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie*," (1861,) which was classed by the orthodox theologians among the best productions of the Tübingen school. He was, in particular, answered by Prof. Beyschlag, who undertook to prove that the Apostles knew very well how to distinguish between visionary and real appearances, and that therefore there was no reason to assume a self-delusion. Dr. Holsten, in the above-named work, defends his views against the replies, and develops them further. Prof. Beyschlag was thereby induced to go again over the whole ground, and after fully stating the theory of Dr. Holsten, to undertake anew an elaborate defense of the reality of the resurrection of Christ. The articles are to be continued and completed in the next number.

Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. By J. P. Lange, D.D., and Rev. F. R. Fay. Translated from the German by J. F. Hurst, D.D. With additions by P. Schaff, D.D., and Rev. M. B. Riddle. 8vo., pp. 455. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

In the Book of Romans, as in Genesis, Dr. Lange comes forth himself, and Dr. Schaff seasonably assures us that both Dr. Hurst, the translator, and himself, the reviser, have taken special care to make Lange always speak intelligible sense. In this effort their success has been scarce complete. Were we to quote any paragraph from Dr. Hodge, it would at once reveal its own clear meaning. But there are plenty of passages of which we freely confess that, though we have performed a considerable amount of reading upon the subject they treat, we doubt what they mean, and which, if quoted, would be scarcely intelligible to our readers. Lange has succeeded well in the Introduction, which is comprehensive and erudite. We know nothing of the kind that surpasses it. The analysis of the book is complex and prolix. An analysis or scheme of a work fails of its object if it is not brief and lucid. We would as readily read the Epistle itself as Lange's summary of it. The textual criticisms are the most valuable parts of the volume. The Homiletical scrip-scraps are entirely out of place in the book. The Exegetical is generally valuable.

As to its theology, which, in a commentary on Romans, is of prime importance, it is exclusively and entirely Calvinistic. Arminian Dr. Hurst is allowed to do the machine work of translation and gathering the homiletical scraps; but he is safely put under keepers, and in the commentary itself no Arminian is allowed to say a word. To the eye of a well-read, clear-minded Arminian the imbecile and self-contradictory attempts to delineate the boundaries between the divine and human in the divine government appear worthy of compassion. Only one thing can be said in their favor; they acknowledge their own failure. But even here they make a sad mistake in not perceiving that the difficulty lies not in the thing, but in themselves, as stultified by a system. They admit that Calvinism is a contradiction, and yet claim that, contradictory or not, it is to be believed. But if Calvinism claims to be exempt from the law of non-contradiction, so may Arminianism or any other *ism*, and thus all reasoning is at an end. A contradiction asserts the prior of two propositions to be

false; and Calvinism, by contradicting itself, asserts itself to be false.

Dr. Schaff's self-contradictions in his share of the commentary are of the very frankest and most transparent nature. Thus he tells us, p. 329: "Those expositors who would limit the sovereignty of the Divine will by human freedom, and deduce salvation *more or less from the creature*, must do great violence to the text if they make it accord with their systems." But, 1. There are no commentators who *limit Divine sovereignty by human freedom*. It is not Divine sovereignty which Arminian divines (for these it is whom Dr. Schaff is here inexcusably misrepresenting) hold to be limited by human freedom, but *the exercise of that sovereignty*. We believe that God is absolute sovereign both over nature and free agents; but we believe that he does most freely limit the exercise of that sovereignty by the laws which he has established both of nature and of agency. This is all our system claims, and this much Dr. Schaff and Calvinism are obliged to acknowledge. 2. The absolute exclusion of all deduction of "salvation," more or less, "from the creature," is the grossest and stupidest fatalism. It is contradicted by all Scripture, and contradicted, on the very next page, by Dr. S. himself, where he exhorts "each to make his own election sure, and *to work out his own salvation*." If a creature should do as here exhorted, work out his own salvation, would not his salvation be in some degree "more or less deduced from the creature?"

Again, on page 313, Dr. Schaff says, "He only is unrighteous who is *under obligations which he does not fulfill;* but God is *under no obligations to His creature*, hence can do with him what he will, (ver. 14–29.) God's will is the absolute and eternal norm of righteousness, and all that he does is necessarily right. There is no norm of righteousness above him to which he is subject, else were God not God."

At this piece of absolutism we stand aghast. A creator, forsooth, is under no more "obligation" to pursue one course than another with his creatures! One course is as right as another, and any other course is as right as this one; so the distinction of right or wrong as to the Divine character and conduct is obliterated, and the moral attributes of God are effaced at one fell swoop. Of course, the man who holds this absurd and abominable doctrine need not be troubled at the doctrine that God decrees the sin and damns the sinner. The imagination of a devil cannot conceive a course which God might not just as rightfully pursue as any other

course. Why, then, does Dr. Schaff attempt to show, as he elaborately does, that of all possible courses God takes just the one that is *the intrinsically right one?* If righteousness consists in the fulfillment of obligation, and God can be under no obligation, then God can possess no righteousness. And if God, as being under no obligation to his creature, can so "do with him as he will"—that any way of willing would be right and equally right—then, surely, there can be no one particular "norm of eternal right." If a creator, finite or infinite, is not bound or obligated to do right and not wrong to his creature, why need Dr. Schaff take pains even to predicate *right* of God's will at all? But it is an appalling doctrine that a creator is under no obligation of specific right toward his creature. If a father owes duties to the child he begets, much more a creator to the being he originates. To say that because he created him he could do no injustice to him, that the creature has no claim of justice or goodness from him, is a truly accursed absurdity; absurdity, because contradictory to our intuitive reason; accursed, because absolutely abhorrent to our moral sense. The talk about such an obligation being "above him," and so undeifying God, is the shallowest of *ad captandum.* It is like an Eastern despot's saying, in an old play, that he is "above slavery to his promise," as if absolution from moral obligation was any elevation, or subjection to it any degradation to any being. Did Abraham think it any degradation in the Judge of all the earth to be obligated to do not wrong but right? Did the Apostle think it any degradation that God cannot lie? Is not God, as the self-existent Being, *under necessity* to exist; and is not that necessity just as truly "above him" as moral obligation? Does the necessity *under* which God is to be omniscient and omnipotent, undeify him? Surely he does not *cease to be God* because *he must be God.* Neither does he cease to be God because he is under moral obligation to be a righteous God. Nay, the necessity of that very "eternal norm of right," which Dr. Schaff holds, is as truly *upon* God and "*over him,*" and so undeifies God as truly as the view he opposes. And if "all he does is necessarily right," is he not under a necessity of doing and being right, with a necessity "above him," and, therefore, no longer God? The being morally obligated to right no more degrades Him than the fact that "all he does is *necessarily* right."

Biblically, this volume adds something to our literature; theologically, nothing.

The Dogmatic Faith: An Inquiry into the Relation subsisting between Revelation and Dogma, in Eight Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1867, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A., Canon of Salisbury. By EDWARD GARBETT, M. A., Incumbent of Christ Church. 12mo., pp. 307. London, Cambridge, and Oxford: Rivington's. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

We think the title of this book would have correctly expressed its import had it been thus worded: Historic Christianity, exhibited in its Central Position, and in its Relation to the Religious Sentiment, to the Intuitions, to Philosophical Speculation, to Modern Civilization, and to Conscience. And as such it is one of the best presentations of the claims of Christianity upon our firm belief, of the present day. The Christian argument is presented, in our opinion, in its true shape, the historical argument as main and central, and all the other as valuable indeed, but subsidiary. The logic of Mr. Garbett is forcible and compact, his style fresh and vigorous, abounding in magnificent periods and brief, sententious expressions, well calculated as permanent embodiments of great principles. The work is worthy to stand by the side of Liddon's Bampton Lectures, as a fit and scarce inferior associate.

Historic Christianity is in our possession, embodied in the Holy Scriptures, and traceable, in a luminous and unmistakable succession, back to the divine Christ himself. The Church of all sections holds those Scriptures in its hand, historically authentic, and a train full and strong of her master-minds extends from Christ to the present hour, showing that while the Church has been the historic custodian of the Scriptures, the Scriptures are the charter and the master of the Church. A scheme of Christian doctrine there is, embodied in the creeds of all the great Churches, ever having been claimed to be authenticated by Scripture, of which the Nicene Creed is a fair average representative, and which is held by the Church of England, and by the forty various confessions of Christendom. This is our concrete, incisive, historic Christian faith, which undeniably did not exist in the year of Rome 747, (the birth-year of Christ,) and did exist in the year of Rome 847 in its full and graphic completeness. This faith, according to all the contemporary documents, came from the lips of the Supernatural One, whose voice was self-pronounced to be the voice of God.

Such is historical Christianity. It is definite, structural, demonstrable. With all the variety of freedoms within its area, admitting full play for idiosyncracies and live discussions, we can draw a rigorous outline around it. By the definiteness and vigor of that boundary line we can unceremoniously cut off the ancient

Ebionitisms and Gnosticisms, as well as their modern identities, the Unitarianisms, Rationalisms, and semi-infidelities that hover around her margin and illegitimately claim the Christian name. With that same sharp historic outline we cut off the modern accretions which Rome has attempted to gather on the faith, upon the historic beginning of which we are able to put our finger and say they did not exist until such and such a time. Thus do we eliminate every foreign element, and have an amply firm ascertainment of the specific identity of our Christianity.

And now in what relations does this concrete structural Christianity stand to the various rivals, as enumerated in the title we have above suggested for the book, presented by modern skeptical thought? The relations, we answer, of real subordination, or of hopeless inferiority. The so-called *Religious Sentiment*, which reveals itself as the basis of the various religious notions of different ages, nations, and individuals, is nothing but man's *susceptibility* to spiritual truth. As a mere susceptibility, and not a formative activity, it can give no positive shape to notions, but receives them as fancy or circumstance collects them upon its receptivity. Historic Christianity is entitled to take them as crude matter and give them its own shape. The *Intuitions*, when their respective validities are ascertained, are taken by Historic Christianity, checked in their overgrowth, supplemented in their deficiencies, assigned their proper place, and embodied into her own system. *Philosophical Speculation*, which begins with subjective ideas, continues in subjective ideas, and ends in subjective ideas, ever undoes itself, being ever obliged to acknowledge its own incapacity for settled result, and has in fact arrived at the full confession of its own invalidity in the philosophy of Comte. Historic Christianity, as an objective fact, acknowledges *no identity with the abstractions which Comteism justly banishes from existence*, but asserts her positive place in a true catholic Positive Philosophy. Christ is as true an historic character as Julius Cæsar; and his true Christianity, as a structural dogma, is as historical as the Roman Empire; with the existence of either "speculation" has nothing to do. Even Comte does not expel history from the domain of true knowledge.

The relations of the Christian dogma to *Conscience*, space obliges us to omit. Its relations to *Civilization* Mr. Garbett ably but, by necessity, too briefly develops. He maintains that for want of a moral basis founded on religious dogma, ancient civilizations literally rotted, and prematurely perished. Christian civili-

zation is already long-lived, and is ever increasing in vitality. He enumerates, as causes of this ever-renewing life, seven distinctive moral superiorities of modern over the ancient civilizations, and specifies the dogmas on which each is based. There is here room for a broader treatment, requiring a volume for its completion. We are surprised that among the distinctive advantages of modern civilization over the ancient Mr. Garbett does not mention *the Church*, with its Bible, its Sabbath, and its ministry. A chapter, too, is needed, showing the relations between Historic Christianity and modern Humanitarianism. How permanent and based the former, how ephemeral and fungus the latter; how self-conceited is the latter to show off its superiority over, and play off its attacks against, the former, Mr. Garbett, from his high historic stand-point, could show with a masterly effect.

The Divine Mysteries: The Divine Treatment of Sin, and the Divine Mystery of Peace. By J. Baldwin Brown. 12mo., pp. 397. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1869.

Judging from his printed pages, we should pronounce Baldwin Brown the prince of the English pulpit at the present day. We have found nothing in Punshon, in Spurgeon, in Liddon, in Garbett superior to the splendor, intensity, and pathos blended in rich varieties in some of his pages. No pulpit periods have we read since the days of Chalmers (whom he is entirely unlike) which we should so like to have heard thundered with all the grace and power of the orator by *the*—or at least by *a—Demosthenem ipsum*. The themes which he treats lie in the very marrow of the Gospel system. All the powers of his soul are given to present the central truths in their intensest vividness, and so to present them as to make them not only *seen* but *felt*, felt to the very depths of the soul. Sin, guilt, misery, death, hell, redemption, grace, glory, heaven—what stupendous themes are these! What higher can the orator demand, and what higher vocation than to wreak their highest power upon the souls of men? These are Mr. Brown's themes, and all the powers of language and of thought are tasked to exhibit them in all their solemn, their terrible, and their glorious realities.

The present volume combines two works originally published at different periods of time. The first, "The Divine Treatment of Sin," is much the more powerful of the two. Man is portrayed as developed into the fearful dignity of an unfolded free agency by the fall; sin as permitted wisely, yet not decreed by God; the

consequent dark, tragic hue that glooms over our nature through human history, as grandly merging into the surpassing glories of God's superabounding grace. In the second part, "The Divine Mystery of Peace," the ineffable wonders of peace and bliss wrought by the work of the glorious Son of God are unfolded in strains of eloquence less varied, more tranquil, and, on the whole, more beautiful.

This is a book not merely suited as a model of pulpit eloquence for the preacher, but of rich, deep religious power for the private Christian. There are those for whom the newspaper, the novel, and the secular monthly furnish no spiritual aliment, and perchance these pages would meet their demands.

Baldwin Brown belongs to the denomination of English Congregationalists, but the entire complexion of his theology is evangelical and Arminian. Some traits of free individualism may be seen in his doctrinal statements, but the structure of his system our readers will approve. Our publishers have enshrined him in a beautiful volume.

The Closing Scenes of the Life of Christ. Being a Harmonized Combination of the Four Gospel Histories of the Last Year of Our Saviour's Life. By D. D. Buck, D.D. With an Introductory Essay by W. D. Wilson, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 293. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. 1869.

If any one doubts the importance of the death of Christ in the Christian system, let him note how large a part of the gospel histories are devoted to its narration. John's Gospel is scarce more than the death scenes of Jesus with an introduction. The crucifixion is the central point of the Bible. It is in full recognition of this fact that Dr. Buck has, with much original thought and skillful labor, combined in one the fourfold pictures of these closing scenes. The critical scholar and the devotional Christian will alike find advantage and profit in consulting his manual. Here is a history to which neither classic antiquity, nor the unburied records of the East, nor all the annals of the world, can furnish a parallel, in the words of inspired writers.

Misread Passages of Scripture. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. 12mo., pp. 129. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1869.

The reading of this brilliant work is both a rich mental enjoyment and a sharp mental discipline. Mr. Brown knows how to riddle, as it were, a passage of Scripture, with a master hand, shake out all the false meanings that have been gathered into it, and then draw forth, in grand and varied expansions, the real

meanings that belong to it. This he does with a richness of thought, a glow of imagination, and a coloring of language keeping the mind of the reader in perpetual play. Rarely will a volume be found so small in compass and so rich in value.

Paul the Preacher; or, a Popular and Practical Exposition of his Discourses and Speeches as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. By JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 462. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Those who are acquainted with Dr. Eadie's high qualities as a commentator will of course know that nothing second-rate will come from his hand. The word "popular" will indicate that the results, rather than the processes of scholarly investigation will appear. Yet on every page will be felt the hand of a master.

A Bible Hand-Book Theologically Arranged. Designed to facilitate the Finding of Proof-Texts on the Leading Doctrines of the Bible. By Rev. T. C. HOLLIDAY, D.D. 12mo., pp. 332. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1869.

Dr. Holliday's work supplies a want both for preachers and people. It is a classification of Scripture texts into a theological structure, thus supplying one of the phases in which it is profitable to study God's Word. It is well entitled to take a permanent place in our religious literature as a valuable manual for ministerial and popular use.

Sermons, preached in St. James Chapel, York Street, London. By Rev. STOPFORD A. BROOKE, M.A., Honorary Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. 12mo., pp. 323. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1869.

Mr. Brooke is, *prima facie*, indorsed as the friend and pupil of the celebrated Robertson of Brighton. The present sermons are able and readable. They endeavor to present religion in its perfect accordance with the most modern thought. The pupil, however, presents little of the rare power of the master.

Kitto's Bible Illustrations. Vol. I. Antediluvians, Patriarchs, and Judges. 12mo., pp. 440. Vol. II. The Kings of Israel. 12mo., pp. 438. Vol. III. Job, Psalms, and Prophets. 12mo., pp. 418. Vol. IV. Our Lord and His Apostles. 12mo., pp. 448. By JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

A magnificent boxed edition of this popular work; suitable for an annual present, and valuable reading for all the year round.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Geschichte des Volkes Israel und der Entstehung des Christenthums. (History of the People of Israel and of the Rise of Christianity.) Von Dr. G. Weber und Dr. H. Holtzmann. Two volumes. Vol. i, 8vo., pp. viii, 460; vol. ii, 8vo., pp. x, 810. Leipzig: Engelmann.

This is part of an extensive literary undertaking commenced ten years ago, and pursued ever since with commendable energy. Six volumes of the "Universal History of the World, with Special Regard to the Intellectual and Cultivated Life of the Nations, by the Aid of Recent Historical Research," have already been published. The present installment is not inferior in literary execution to any of the rest. The first volume embraces the following topics: The Land of Syria and its Inhabitants; Abraham, Moses, and the Judges; Saul, David, and Solomon; The Double Kingdom of Israel and Judah; The Captivity and Return; A Retrospect on the Literary and Intellectual Life of the Hebrews. The second volume: Introduction; The Dispersion of Alexandrine Heathendom; The Age of the Maccabees; Inward Condition of Judaism; The Roman Supremacy; The Messianic Appearance of Jesus; The Last Hundred Years of the Jewish State; The Inward Development of Christianity in the Roman Kingdom. The Rationalistic proclivities of the authors appear here and there very decidedly, whenever there is an opportunity afforded. They hold that it was not until the very closing part of Christ's life that the disciples recognized him as the Messiah. The account of Christ's life is derived from the three synoptical Evangelists, for John's Gospel is not in harmony with them. Paul's life is a development, but not inspired in the scriptural sense. His Epistles arose from a great activity of the intellect, similar to the ideas of our speculative German philosophy; only Paul's ideas belonged less than those of the German philosophers to the department of pure, retired thought; but they were more friendly and breathed a more living form. The Jewish scholastic period was the rock on which he built. A Jewish element pervades all his writings.

As is very natural, all who are enamored with the new Heidelberg theology have bestowed great praise on this work. For ourselves, we must say, as we look at the time, learning, and mechanical labor required to bring these two beautiful volumes before the reader, "Why such waste?"

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Bible Animals. Being a Description of Every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures, from the Ape to the Coral. By Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A., F.L.S., etc., Author of "Homes Without Hands," etc. With One Hundred New Designs 8vo., pp. 652. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

To those who unite a taste for natural history with a love of the Bible, this will be found one of the most attractive publications of the times. It aims to interpret scientifically the various passages in which animals are mentioned in the Scriptures. These passages are numerous and interesting. Animals are named in the law; they figure in the history of the chosen people; they appear in poem, prophecy, and parable. Animated nature has a place of some importance among the studies of those who wish to understand all parts of the Divine Word, as well as to be prepared to defend it against the assaults of its enemies. In the volume before us, both the author and the publisher have done their work well. The subject is treated intelligently and thoroughly, the style interests and pleases, and there is much valuable information to be gained by the reader. The mechanical execution is admirable—good paper, clear, legible print, and a hundred engravings which are real illustrations.

Two Letters on Causation and Freedom in Willing. Addressed to John Stuart Mill. With an Appendix on the Existence of Matter, and Our Notion of Infinite Space. By Rowland G. Hazard. 12mo., pp. 300. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

Mr. Hazard is author of a valuable work on The Will defending its true freedom from the law of causational necessity. In the present volume he boldly and ably meets the arguments of the great materialistic advocate of necessity. Thinkers in this department of speculation will find his writings well worthy of consultation.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. Alumni Records, 1833 to 1869. Compiled by Orange Judd, A. M. (Class 1847.) 8vo., pp. 264. New York: O. Judd & Co. 1869.

Conversing a few months since with Rev. Mr. Bird, for many years Wesleyan Missionary in Hayti, and author of a volume, noticed on another page entitled "The Black Man in Hayti," we were informed by him that many of the sons of the wealthier Haytians are sent to Paris for their education, and very uniformly return confirmed, and often boastful, Atheists. Deeply

wrong, as it truly is, that the education of the young in Austria should be placed by law in Jesuitical hands, it is very possibly true that the sad alternative, to a large degree, lies between the Jesuit and the infidel professor. The student masses, in some parts of Europe, to a large and increasing amount, are, under existing influences, blatant, mob-like denouncers of God. So fearfully is this the fact that the London *Spectator*, a year or two ago, predicted that the closing century would be a period of the blackest unbelief ever known to European history.

And there seems to be in this country, in process of inauguration, a scheme for producing in our own colleges a correspondently irreligious condition. Rationalists and infidels have seldom built colleges. They find it more cheap to steal than manufacture. With how pious a purpose Harvard was founded, and how terribly it does not fulfill that purpose, is generally known. The *Nation*, not long since, took the ground that ministers are unfit to be educators. The assigned reason was, that theirs is that effeminate morality, unsuited to secular life, which prompts the coupling, so often expressed, of "ministers and women." In other words, Christian morality ought to be excluded from our colleges. And, of course, *à fortiori*, ministers are still less fit guides for the adult; and so are fit, ministerially, for nothing but non-existence.

Not long since the *Independent* presented us an editorial headed "Protestant Cullenism," not less outspoken. Dr. Cullen, of Ireland, forbade, on pain of exclusion from the Holy Sacrament, all Irish Catholics from sending their children to the government schools; and parallel to this, Austria compels, by law, the children to accept a Jesuit schooling. The Editor then lets forth a strain of eloquent denunciation which, as being poured upon Austrian Jesuits, could safely be very fierce and unrestrained; but the next paragraph lets us know that under the gowns of these Jesuits he is really whipping the shoulders of the free Protestant, and especially the Methodist ministry of America, who have not the slightest purpose of putting their sons into the hands of infidel professors, or into the halls of infidel colleges, for their educational training. This the brilliant Editor seems quite determined they shall do, or experience the fierceness of his editorial bastinado. In denouncing Austrianism he becomes Austrian himself. He assumes to lay his imperial (or imperious) injunction upon the freedom of American Christian parents, and prohibit them from exercising their own parental responsibility in securing a Christian education for their sons and daughters.

He indeed flinches from stating this to be the true issue. He

writes as if it were "secular colleges," (like the Michigan University and Cornell College,) to which we object. It is not, however, to the *secularity* of any college, but to the *anti-Christianity* seeking (vainly, we trust, in regard to the former) to get possession of them. Secular colleges, in the sense of non-denominational, where the various sections of Christianity unite, pervaded by a common religion, are to us matters of warm interest. Such an one we have had in past times at Ann Arbor, and in spite of some spots of ill omen (among which this dubious patronage by the *Independent* is, perhaps, one) we shall in future have. But when the so-called "secular colleges" become strongholds of irreligion, we shall assert and use our right to do two things. We shall utter a very distinct pronunciation of the fact; and we shall withhold our children from the teachings of its professors. What does our talented Editor propose to do about it?

Not only does not irreligion build colleges, but, in all ages, such has been the affinity of mental development with religion, that piety has been the founder and the priest has been the educator. The cause lies in the fact that true intellectual culture and religion are alike an aspiration and an ascent of man's higher faculties toward the Divine. It was religious faith, not unfaith, that founded the Universities of Continental Europe in the Middle Ages, and of Cambridge and Oxford in England. In America, Harvard and Yale were established by the earnest efforts of Christian ministers and laymen, whose first anxieties were to secure thereby a godly ministry, and a cultured intellectual aristocracy, for New England's future. One of the first cares of the first founders of Methodism in America was to found Cokesbury College. When that was twice burnt down, humbled Methodism, despised by the collegiate caste of the day, grew discouraged, and, in her less informed ranks, opposed to the highest educational institutes. When the era for their establishment came, our people were largely distrustful lest colleges should become the enemies of a true and simple piety. And what was it that dissipated that distrust and created a unanimity in our Church in behalf of academies and colleges? It was, as we well recollect, personally, *the sweeping revivals that took place within their walls.* The Methodist opposer of lofty "book learning" was utterly disintegrated when he found *that the seminary was the place to get his ungodly children converted.* A true Christian university, under the patronage and tuition of highly cultured Christian men, forming a little model Christian republic, self-governed through the power of Christian influence, where our sons and daughters are trained to the highest style of Christian

manhood and womanhood, has become with Methodism a controlling ideal. It has become a part of her programme of molding the world to that same ideal. Of that other sort of university, which this movement is laboring, unconsciously, perhaps, to introduce, where the infidel sneer curls the *savant's* lips, and the blatant blasphemy is the pupil's response; where the revival is a jest and prayer is unheard; where the Sabbath is a carouse and the only Church is a club of Atheism; where the soul is materialized, and a brutifying science debases its followers into a practical bestiality, her abhorrence is profound, and, we trust in God, will never diminish.

The Editor of the *Independent* indicates his purpose of returning to the subject again. We doubt not that his farther treating it in just that style will do unintentional good. There is an alarm already arising in our Christian community—it is beginning to stir the heart of Methodism—at the efforts to heathenize our colleges, and every such editorial will deepen the alarm and quicken the efforts of the friends of truly Christian universities. Our "secular colleges" may, we hope not all, fall under infidel corporations and faculties; but our Riehs, Claflins, and Judds will be multiplied by scores, and our Christian universities will find a new and better era in their history.

Against this antichristian movement Mr. Judd has here presented a monumental argument. It presents the noble results of one feeble Christian college. It is a history we flaunt in the face of the pseudo-liberalism of the hour, which, with great swelling and lying words, claims all the philanthropy, and sets that philanthropy in array against religion. Mr. Judd's friends were surprised at the personal outlay he was making upon this work, until his founding a scientific department in his maternal university obliterated their concern by showing that he was not merely a grateful son, but a large-minded benefactor. This benefaction will be the exemplar and parent of similar benefactions to this and others of our denominational universities, and the dawn of a better day for our literary interests. It is, moreover, a timely stroke to indicate that the Wesleyan is not to be abandoned, but to live and prosper. And we hope, too, that it will prove a most impressive suggestion that *we need but one New England university upon which fraternally to concentrate our entire and earnest effort, through at least the entire remainder of our present century;* and we believe we may truly add, *through an entire century to come.*

Let not our Boston friends—for some of our dearest and noblest friends are in the secession movement we deprecate—impute any

sectional motive to our frank words; for our earnest plea and protest are in behalf, not of a New York, but of a New England college. By ancestry, by long residence, by cherished sympathies, by type of mind and set of principles, we are entitled to speak as a New Englander. And we say that, to divide the strength of New England Methodism upon two universities, for at least a century to come, is to destroy her educational position. Instead of one commanding empyrian strength, she will have two weaknesses; instead of one glory, two shames. We are aware that it is proposed, generously, to donate one of the two to New York; but if New England chooses to desert her New England college, what right or reason has she to claim or suppose that New York will not also retire into her own shell, and have her own nice little pocket college too? And so we may have three shames instead of two. A large share of our own sons will decline to enter either of these small concerns; nor will there be a single Eastern Methodist college able to confer a first-class diploma. Nor are we in the slightest degree fascinated by that showy ciphering that finds such a vast treasury in the pockets of our laity that we can build a catalogue of New England colleges. For, while that ciphering is going on, our missions are shuddering at the prospect of defalcation and reduction; our Extension Society is crying out that the golden hour is being lost for want of a little gold; our colleges are discrediting the Church by starving their Professors and driving our most ambitious students to better-endowed and better-furnished colleges of other denominations; while our academies and seminaries, even in New England, are struggling for existence. If, indeed, we ministers are distributers for an immense fund in the lay pockets, let us conscientiously husband the gold-mountain and divide it off wisely. And that wise husbanding says, that one noble university for New York and New England is all they can support without injustice to the other departments of Church enterprise.

To our seceding Boston friends we must also say, "Brethren, you are breaking a wisely-formed, time-honored compact." From personal knowledge we affirm that it was the wish, successively, of that line of great men, Wilbur Fisk, Nathan Bangs, and Stephen Olin, to establish a theological department at the University. "No," said the Massachusetts brethren; "you have the University, we must have the seminary." In compliance with that compact the Wesleyan has never established a theological department. Boston now, by claiming both, exonerates Middletown from her abstinence, Boston cannot argue that New England needs not two seminaries;

for New York then replies that, equally, she needs not two universities. If Boston undertakes to erect both in her own limits, she is bound, in justice to herself, to expend her entire resources in sustaining them respectably, and can in future bestow no such patronage upon the Wesleyan as—after the demise of two or three memorable benefactors—will justly entitle her to any veto power. It fairly and honorably will rest with Connecticut or New York to establish, as can be done and at comparatively small cost, a Theological Department at Middletown. This result we earnestly deprecate, but fear that the influence of the Boston enterprise has already awakened the purpose too decidedly for its possible prevention. Our earnest wish, for which we now write, is, that the old compact should be renewed; that Boston should erect her noble Seminary, and that Boston and New York should join hand and heart in bringing to a splendid completion our one compromise University, at that fortunate middle-point cut by the air-line which connects the two great cities.

Rameses the Great; or, Egypt 3300 Years Ago. Translated from the French of F. DE LANOYE. With Thirty-nine Wood-cuts by Lancelot, Sellier, & Bayard. Small 12mo., red and gilt. Pp. 296. New York: Scribner & Co. 1870.

Egyptology, in this handsome little volume, appears both attractive and orthodox. It is dedicated to "the illustrious master of Egyptian lore, the Vicompte De Rougé," on whose teachings it professes to be largely based. The style is fresh and flowing, and the illustrations give it life and reality. It presents a comparative table of the records of Manetho and the monuments, with suggestive comments by the author. In spite of its over-rhetorical style and somewhat involved periods, and its plentiful allusions that presuppose considerable acquaintance with the subject on the part of the reader, it furnishes the best manual for the tyro that we are able to name.

In ethnology the author believes not so much in "races of men," as in "branches of the great family of man." He maintains that "the more the torch of history gains in clearness, the more concise should chronology become, and ancient time approach our own." "To build Memphis, in the company of Menes, 5800 years before our era, upon the filled-up bed of the Nile diverted from its course; to believe piously in the books of anatomy written by Athoth, the son and successor of the first-named dynastic founder; to unreservedly admit the authenticity of the ancestral images carried before the kings at religious ceremonies, and the filiation of the three hundred and forty-five *Pi-Roumis* mentioned by Herodotus;

to rear the Pyramids of Gizeh in the time of the brothers Supphi or Chouffou, of the fourth dynasty, forty or fifty centuries before Christ; and to put back the origin of the grand hydraulic and architectural monuments of Fayoum fifteen hundred years anterior to Thotmes III., to Seti I., to Rameses Meiamoun; to cause the conquest of Asia, two thousand five hundred years before the Saviour, by an Osmyandias and a Sesourtasen, personages of whom the heroes of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties would be merely feeble imitators—all this was, for a long time in France, and is still in Germany, a source of pleasure even to grave adepts in science, that it would be perilous to disturb by calm discussion."

Dr. Thompson, in his "Genesis and Geology," refers to the fact that the Table of Abydos exhibits Sethos Second as paying homage to seventy-six ancestors as decisive demonstration that our common chronology must be lengthened. Dr. Hackett, in his notes to Smith's Biblical Dictionary, gives the same emphasis. Lanoye acutely replies: "At Rome, also, in many public and private ceremonies, there were exhibited along with the images of ancestors those of the gods to which the Roman patricians pretended to trace their origin. But have modern historians ever come to the conclusion, from the presence of the images of Mars and Venus at the funeral rites of Julius or Martius, that those fetiches of the primitive clans of Latium ever had a real personal existence? Assuredly not. Yet this is what Egyptian investigators do in our day, in regard to Menes and many mythical personages of ancient Egypt." Lanoye still further replies that the list of the Table of Abydos is contradicted by other lists, showing, in fact, that down to a certain epoch the sacerdotal editors made out lists of kings according to their own choice. "This epoch was the commencement of the famous 12th dynasty of the *Sesortasens* and the *Amenemhas*. In ascending from Rameses II. to Amenemha I., (from the nineteenth to the 12th inclusive,) every thing is clear, every thing follows in the same order on the different documents; but, in taking the last named king for the point of departure, all becomes doubt and confusion excepting at the epoch, comparatively free from clouds and mists, of the Pharaohs who built the great pyramids. Hence we may conclude that the learned copyists and scribes of the colleges at Thebes and Memphis composed, in the fourteenth century preceding the Christian era, a history of Egypt in which the whole period anterior to the 12th dynasty is but a tissue of fables, legends, and traditions toned down to the historic form—something like the history of England written in the ninth and tenth centuries by

monks, and translated into Latin by Geoffrey of Monmouth. The papyrus at Turin is a collection of this nature, with its mythical kings, its divine dynasties, and its legendary conquerors and lawgivers. The history of Manetho is probably but an abridgment or an amplification of these traditions; and thus, these compilations of the fourteenth century before our era bring no support to the history of Manetho in all that concerns the epochs anterior to the commencement of the 12th dynasty. And, in fact, it is with this period that Manetho himself opens the second book of his history, and emerges from the confused eras of the unfamiliar dynasties and nameless kings, in order to enter upon the historically and monumentally well ascertained series of kings belonging to the 12th dynasty." All this would seem to solve very plausibly the problem of Egyptian chronology.

Geological Egypt is, Lanoye maintains, an alluvium of 26 feet maximum thickness, laid upon a bottom of marine sand. Scientific calculations indicate that of this there is deposited .4134 of a foot per century; so that Geological Egypt is no more than 6350 years old. Historical Egypt, based upon this, must be still younger; so that the immense Egyptological ages since the first king Menes cannot be chronologically real. The only reconciliation between Geology and Egyptology is to suppose that previous to the twelfth dynasty the year was a period of but four months. Such a year Dr. Brugsh admits to be suggested by hieroglyphical phenomena. Lanoye asserts that it is geologically certain that, at the most, five thousand years before Rameses, "Egypt was still oscillating between the waves of the sea and the rays of the sun."

Great clearness is flung over the treatment of the subject for the young reader, by making the illustrious Rameses the Great the central figure. Of the twenty-six dynasties, it is then seen that there are two most important points—the *nineteenth*, in which Egypt, under Rameses, attains her zenith; (and in which, according to Rougé, Moses was born;) and the *twelfth*, which may, as Lanoye thinks, be roughly styled the commencement of reliable history. The name of Rameses is identified, in a curious etymological essay by Rougé, with the Sesostris of Greek historians. By blending all accounts together, we have a biography of the great conqueror of great interest and historical value. Egypt had been gradually rising in grandeur through the previous dynasty, especially during the reigns of the three sovereigns who bore the name of Thothmes; but suddenly declined under the immediate successors of Rameses, leaving ample scope for the Mosaic exodus.

History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By K. R. HAGENBACH, D.D. Translated from the last German edition, with additions, by Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D.D. 12mo. Vol. I, pp. 504. Vol. II, pp. 487. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

History of the Church *in Germany*, should be the limitation in the title of this work. A German, like a Chinaman of fifty years ago, knows not that his fatherland is not all the world save an unexplorable outside margin. That *outside* has been for the last thirty years eagerly exploring the *inside*, and the present work will largely aid in unfolding its mysteries and curiosities. In due time, we doubt not, the German mind will, like the Chinese, awake to wider conceptions and larger liberalities. Dr. Schaff and Dr. Hurst are enacting in no small degree the Burlingame mission; and Teutonia will slowly get a true notion of the geography, religious as well as physical, of the globe.

Dr. Hagenbach is already well known to theological scholars by his admirable history of doctrines, rendered still more admirable by the modifications it received from the learned American translator, Professor Henry B. Smith. He belongs to the mildly evangelical school, and his works are characterized throughout by a clear historical candor and fairness. The present volumes will be read with great interest by the liberal American scholar. The form of lectures allows the learned author to indulge in a free, colloquial, simplified style, yet not wholly unrhetorical, or at all wanting in dignity. His intellect is acute, his temper amiable, his style flowing and often eloquent. The work is pregnant with rich inferences and momentous lessons to the evangelical Church. Though we do not recognize in its author a great, broad, comprehensive, philosophical judgment, yet such is the ground it covers, and its mastery of the train of events, that his work must occupy a standard position, and his pages will attract, fascinate, and instruct a large body of American readers. The portraitures of character are not the least attractive trait of the work. The Fredericks, the Pietists, Lessing, Bengel, Zinzendorf, Herder, Goethe, Kant, Schiller, Fichte, Schelling, pass before us, in pictures more or less full, with the important point of their relations to Christianity and the part played by them in the great awakening.

The Wesleys are duly and, on the whole, candidly, if not quite satisfactorily, depicted; and it is curious that almost the only excursion taken by the author out of Germany is to get hold of them. The faults of Wesley criticised by Hagenbach, perhaps, mostly existed; but, positively, of the true significance and his-

toric magnitude of Methodism he has no due conception. Dr. Hurst's points of defense appear to us not always quite well taken. A tinge of "asceticism" did adhere to Wesley, perhaps, even to the last; and it took American Methodism nearly a century to wipe it from her own record. Asbury's rules for Cokesbury College were so truly ascetic that we have sometimes been inclined to say that the building was righteously burned. Wesley's tract *on Dress* embodies much truth needed in these extravagant days, but rendered nearly abortive by its ascetic extreme. It is not long since we abolished from our Discipline the "enormous bonnets;" a phrase that shows that Mr. Wesley's shaft aimed at "the flying Cynthia of the minute," and would curiously fail to hit the minified scabs worn on the feminine capitals of the present season.

The History of Rome. By THEODOR MOMMSEN. Translated, with the Author's sanction and additions, by Rev. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D. D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow, etc. With a Preface by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ. New Edition, in Four Volumes. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 635. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

Theodor Mommsen has here presented the final results which German erudition has attained in completing the revolution inaugurated by Niebuhr in reconstruing Roman history. He whose youth was fed and fascinated with the life-like character, stirring events, and prolix speeches furnished by Livy and Dionysius, and wrought into brief, smooth English by Goldsmith, or conglomerated into the huge masses of Hooke, finds his idols not merely smashed, but banished, and often unnamed. The chaste and tragic Lucretia is a myth, Numa is a name, and Romulus an etymology. Deprived of its individual narratives, and reduced to dissertation, Roman history before the time of Pyrrhus can never again be *popular*. Boys and mechanics will never again hang over its pages with fascination.

But to the cultured mind a new and higher interest arises. Legendary individuals and events are merged in mass movements. We have races traced, especially by means of the wonderful uses of scientific philology, to their relations and origins; we have growths and stages of civilization clearly pictured; we have political revolutions and laws and institutions explained in their true significance, and we possess a natural image of peoples becoming a people, and growing into the most wonderful empire of the ancient world. We have, then, a work of profound interest; the best view that complete erudition and acute criticism is able

to furnish of the grandest providential phenomenon in history anterior to the development of the modern system of European nations.

The translation was no mere literary job, but a voluntary labor of love. For its trueness to the German Dr. Mommsen himself vouches; the clearness and purity of the English a very few pages of perusal will verify to the reader. We doubt not that Mr. Scribner will find his account in pushing the entire work to a rapid completion.

The Romance of Spanish History. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT, Author of "The French Revolution," "The History of Napoleon Bonaparte," etc., etc. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 462. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

This is a very readable book; hard to lay down, no matter at what place you open it. The history of Spain is a veritable romance, sometimes wild, sometimes beautiful, and not seldom horrible, but in all its phases possessing a strange fascination. The peninsula being overrun, and held for a time by successive armed immigrations of Carthaginians, Romans, Goths and Moors, there was an incessant conflict of races and religions. For twenty centuries Spanish history has been a weird panorama of light and darkness, good and evil, of battle and blood, of chivalry and cowardice, of grandeur and meanness, of noble deeds and foul crimes that seemed scarcely human. And with Roman and Goth, Moor and Spaniard and Jew to form the picture, and central figures like Scipio and Wamba, Abderaman and Columbus, Ferdinand and Isabella, even an ordinary limner could hardly fail to produce something to attract and hold the eye of the spectator.

Mr. Abbott is no ordinary limner, but one who possesses rare skill in selecting and grouping the elements of his pictures. We commend the book to all our readers.

Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, relating to all Ages and Nations, for Universal Reference. Edited by BENJAMIN VINCENT, Assistant Secretary and Keeper of the Library of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, and Revised for the Use of American Readers. 8vo., pp. 541. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

This valuable work is, as one of its English editors styles it, "A dated encyclopedia, a digested summary of every department of human history, brought down to the very eve of publication." It is, consequently, a work that never will be finished to the end of time, but of which the part already completed will never lose its interest. The author published his work in 1841, and, during the fifteen years of his after-life, issued

seven editions, each written up to its date. Since his death, in 1856, repeated editions by other hands have borne steady testimony to the wisdom of the plan, and the ability of the execution. It is a miniature encyclopedia, a leading feature of which is to note the date pertaining to the event, the character, the discovery, the transaction, which it briefly narrates. Able American hands have incorporated in it, each in its alphabetic place, the memorabilia of recent American history. An index, filling thirteen pages, enumerates the 15,000 articles contained in the volume, and makes the treasures gathered still more available for rapid use. It is, in fact, a concentrated extract of human history in all its departments; and, now we have the book, we do not see how we ever got along without it.

A Winter in Florida; or, Observations on the Soil, Climate, and Products of our Semi-tropical State; with Sketches of the principal Towns and Cities in Eastern Florida. To which is added, a brief Historical Summary, together with Hints to the Tourist, Invalid, and Sportsman. By LEYARD BILL. Illustrated. Second Edition. 12mo., pp. 222. New York: Wood & Holbrook.

Scientifically and historically, Florida is a wonderful romance. Through millions of years were the coral mites employed in building it as an oriental pendant for our occidental continent. The sea and sun have combined to give it a soft, perpetual summer, and to adorn its soil with natural flower-gardens and fruit-orchards. Probably no river-sides in the world compare with those of the broad St. John's in luxuriant floral beauty. No spot on the continent produces so easily the needs of rural subsistence. Emancipated from the curse of its old oligarchy, its portals are open to free immigration, and it offers very seductive inducements to enterprise. There is in New York a Florida Land Company prepared to inform and aid all interested. Mr. Bill's book is written in a free and easy style, with considerable power of graphic description, and is doubtless reliable for all invalids and other inquirers.

The Polar World: a Popular Description of Man and Nature in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions of the Globe. By Dr. G. HARTWIG. With one hundred and sixty illustrations. 8vo., pp. 486. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

The narratives and descriptions, not of one traveler alone, but, eclectically, of all the travelers together. It is wonderful to contemplate how the God of nature has filled these forbidding regions with quaintnesses, dangers, grandeurs, and splendors. Man appears here in his most degraded forms and characteristics, and yet there is the marvelous history of Icelandic civilization and literature to rescue even polar man from unmitigated contempt, and from the complete hopelessness of his future.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part I. Abraham to Samuel. 8vo., pp. 588. Part II. From Samuel. Pp. 656. With Maps and Plans. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church. With an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. 12mo., pp. 550. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

A call for the issue by Mr. Scribner of a new edition of these brilliant works is no matter of wonder. We expressed our high admiration for the genius of Dean Stanley on their first appearance. No one can read his touches of Old Testament history (notwithstanding their tinge of neology) without feeling a fresh interest in those wonderful and venerable records. To the preacher and expositor they are both suggestive and inspiring. His review of the Eastern Church furnishes what we Occidentals need, and rejoice to know.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D.D. Vol. V. England Geneva Ferrara. 12mo., pp. 470. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1869.

D'Aubigne's great work is in two series of volumes; one covering the history to the Augsburgh Confession, the other closing with the permanent success of the Reformation in various nations. This is the fifth volume of the second series, and the tenth of the whole. It embraces the zenith of Henry VIII. and the period of the appearance of Calvin on the stage. The eloquent, pictorial, evangelical character of this work has made it a great favorite with American Christians.

History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. Vol. II. 12mo., pp. 501. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

This is to be a *popular* edition of the history of this eminent writer. The author, as our readers well know, is an enthusiast on the side of freedom and advancement, not to say of doubt and moral daring. The style is remarkable for directness, polish, and point. Its great excellence consists of power in depicting not merely great characters, but an *age*, an age pregnant with coming ages. The great story will bear rewriting, and it is here performed by the hand of a master.

The Black Man; or, Haytien Independence. Deduced from Historical Notes, and Dedicated to the Government and People of Hayti. By M. B. BIRD. 12mo., pp. 401. New York: Published by the Author. Trade supplied by the American News Co.

Mr. Bird's book is a valuable and standard manual for all who take interest in Hayti, or would investigate an important, but not

wholly encouraging, chapter in *negro* history. It embraces thrilling details and some striking historical characters. Mr. Bird's style is rather diffuse; a more compact statement would reduce the size and increase the value of the volume.

The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander, D.D., Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. By HENRY CARRINGTON ALEXANDER. 2 vols. 12mo., pp. 917. New York: Scribner & Co. 1870.

A new edition of a valuable biography, noticed by us in a former number, and reviewed in a full article by Rev. Dr. Crane.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

Popular Amusements. By J. T. CRANE, D.D., of the Newark Conference. With an Introduction, by Bishop E. S. JANES. Large 16mo., pp. 209. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1869.

We remember hearing Jacob Gruber say, in a sermon at a Maryland camp-meeting, that "when Father Asbury saw the first piano in a Methodist family he cried like a child; next," he said, "would be dancing, and then the world and the devil and all." A curious comment on this speech met us a year or two ago in a picture of *Harper's Weekly*, exhibiting the blessed contrast between the young man in the parlor with the young ladies at the piano, and the young man lounging in the liquor and billiard saloon. How truly and rightly to make the home attractive without its including those exhilarations which become the avenue and stepping-stones to extravagances and dissipations, is a serious problem. We doubt if the line can be more wisely drawn than is here done both by Bishop Janes and Dr. Crane. Dr. Crane's work is done in his best style. There are logic, rhetoric, philosophy, and now and then some lively "amusement" in it. It is written in no ascetic style.

Against the theater, the horse-race, and the base-ball, and against cards, chess, and billiards, for good grounds, as assigned by Dr. Crane, the Church has taken a very unanimous position. Very rightly and forcibly he subjoins against novel-reading a vigorous protest, of which a share of our ministry, we fear, has need. And to this might be added, so far as too many of our young ministry are concerned, an enfeebling amount of mental dissipation and a waste of valuable time in pouring over the trashy periodical literature of the day, to the neglect of standard biblical and theological acquirements, and especially *to the unpardonable neglect of taking and reading our Quarterly.*

There are two classes for whom active recreations—we might say vacation and play—are needed, but who have in earlier days been the most specially excluded classes, namely, ministers and students. We doubt whether the inventory of recreations laid down by Bishop Janes is quite sufficient for the drudged pastor. We remember Brother Janes himself in the days of his routine pastorship, and while we remember that, mentally and spiritually, he was a very "live man," yet corporeally, facially, and locomotively, he made a very corpse-like impress upon a spectator's retina. The episcopate has broken the routine, and given him, by sea and land, a broad variety and a healthy *physique*. But numbers of us will not be successful as candidates for the episcopate; and *some*, perchance, may even not be candidates at all! If any body has a right to the ball and the bowl and the bat, it is not the fast young gentry who monopolize them, but those who preach and *resolve* themselves, and are bishoped and conferenced, into exclusion from them.

Very properly, Dr. Crane's book is *esoteric;* that is, addressed to the Church solely, and stating the case on religious and ecclesiastical grounds. To the class of pure ethicists, who are earnestly elaborating a universal and fundamental *morale*, based on eternal principles, he addresses no argument. To them much of the argument would possess no validity. Especially the common argument, drawn from what the world thinks, is held to be a vicious circle; inasmuch as the world thinks just what the Church has taught it, and it is only holding the Church to its own standard. Had Asbury succeeded in banning the piano, Dr. C. might have said, "You see what the world thinks of a piano-playing Christian." And, in fact, there is a class of moral thinkers who decline the Church's teaching, and assert that "a minister ought to play croquet," and who maintain that the antagonism put by the Church between amusement and spiritual-mindedness is a factitious one. They charge the Church with a *made morality*, and a manufactured sin. They believe that there is not the slightest incongruity in a family dance before evening prayers. We have seen a Methodist prayer-meeting held regularly in a bowling-room; and, singular to say, not the slightest incongruity was felt in passing from one exercise to the other! Into this extra-religious and ethical department of the subject Dr. Crane, wisely, does not enter. It needs no controversy. If the Church has hereafter occasion to change her position it will be by imperceptible degrees. One century hence a Methodist Bishop may be as far from Bishop Janes as he from Bishop Asbury. For the

present she has enough to do in resisting the incoming and almost overwhelming tide of frivolity that threatens to submerge the age.

And, with Coleridge, we may rightly say that there is not only an absolute but a prudential morality. Practical prudence may require us to draw the prohibitory line *not at the precise boundary between right and wrong*, but just where the line which excludes the wrong (and perhaps a little more) may be most clearly drawn, and, in practice, most successfully maintained. Total abstinence may not be in itself absolutely obligatory; but it is the clearest, most incisive, and most maintainable excluder of intemperance attainable. What better ground the future may attain we know not.

Dr. Crane jealously conditions and barely allows "social gatherings;" we should *recommend* them. We think that a Church should *provide for them and control them*. We know few better safeguards for our young men than social recreation established by the Church and kept within bounds. Little improprieties, doubtless, may occur at them; but nothing in comparison with the ruin that ensues by driving our young men for recreation to questionable resorts.

Periodicals.

The Southern Methodist Press.

Our readers are well aware that from the close of the late civil war until the present time our *Quarterly* has advocated the cause of conciliation, of churchly recognition, and of possible ultimate union on the basis of freedom, and on terms of perfect equality, of the two Methodisms. To the Southern Church this would afford the special advantage of acquiring for its annual Conferences an undivided jurisdiction over the Southern territory, the ample aids of Northern Methodism, and an open way into fraternity with universal Methodism. To the entire united Church it would present the means of a free national circulation, affording an interchange of ministers between the entire North and South. Such an interchange would give a new zest and unity both to Church and nation. Save in transient incidentals—*transient*, if we are wise—the two Churches are *one*. We are *one* in our blessed old Arminian theology, and *one* in our methods of earnest evangelism. Unless adverse political convulsions break us up, we are *one* on the future great questions of the day. That is, we are *one* against the menaces of Romanism; one against the still more threatening inva-

sion of Rationalism and Infidelity; one against the assaults upon the existance of the Christian Sabbath; against every form of intemperence and demoralization. Our forces concentrated upon these great questions would blessedly affect our national destinies.

Judging, however, from the tone of the Southern Methodist press, the Church, South, is rather increasing than diminishing in the spirit of separation. The leading organ, the *Nashville Advocate*, a few months after the late Episcopal correspondence, published, with hearty encomiums, an article from a writer abroad reviewing the correspondence in a sarcastic tone, showing how finely on every point the Northern Bishops were rebuffed, and predicting that *this would be the last attempt* at reunion ever to be made. In a notice of Dr. Wakeley's life of the Southern Abolitionist, Cravens, the Editor flouts at the idea of "dead issues," strongly averring that the publication of severe condemnation of slavery at our Northern Book Rooms constitutes *a living issue*, inasmuch as it disparages the reputation of deceased virtuous slaveholders. This forms a curious contradiction of the assertion of the Southern Bishops that slavery ever was an issue between the two Methodisms—an assertion preposterously at war with the history of the last forty years. We said, in our last discussion of this subject, that while we were ready to withhold all references to slavery in the animus of *reproach* upon a Southern Church in union with us, we would never accept a padlock on our lips, precluding the treatment of slavery with full historical and ethical condemnation. This condemnation may reflect upon individuals, both living and dead, North as well as South, whom we profoundly revere; but we revere them too purely to sacrifice truth and righteousness to their reputation. We lived years of Church-union with, we accepted the sacramental cup, nay, our ministerial appointments from, men whose course on this subject we most deeply condemned. In spite of their great wrong-doing on this subject, we revere the names of Capers and Winans and Soule and Bangs. But if any man or Church require us to sacrifice truth to that reverence upon penalty of disunion, then be it, while the world stands, irrevocable disunion.

The editor of the *Southern Christian Advocate* rehearses in bitter spirit and language the misdeeds of our Church, and points out the only road to—not *union*, but—even *fraternization*. The Methodist Episcopal Church, forsooth, adopting the policy of "disintegration and absorption," has sent her paid missionaries into the South, who have made no attempt to convert the wicked world, but have solely

drawn scattered deserters from the Church South. They have thus won only the *contempt* (expressed in copious phrases and strong terms by the writer) both of the Editor and the entire South. Of such wickedness they ought to "*repent.*" He does not object to any body's voluntarily joining our Church, if they will only pay their own way; but so long as our Church pours her funds into the South to organize a mission Church, (he is willing to have us give our funds to the Church South to distribute,) *no offer of fraternization will be accepted.* This is, we think, explicit and decisive. *Both Editors present impassible barriers between the two Churches.*

Now, to all this we need not now repeat the reply made by us in a former article, that *the very offer of reunion is the offer to right, as well as to forget, all wrongs*, given or received; that what our Bishops would probably propose would, in effect, be a placing the Southern section under the jurisdiction of Southern Conferences, so that all we have there built up would inure, co-ordinately, to what is now the Church South. To that offer the Southern press makes no intelligent response, but goes on rehearsing the past, and *refusing to hear of a righting of wrongs—because wrongs have been committed!*

At the close of the rebellion, in reading the Southern Methodist papers, which started into sight like sudden stars in the dark firmament, we recognized—before the Southern politicians had done their fatal work—what appeared to us a spirit of humble penitence and of conciliation, so hopeful of a better future that we announced it to the North by several pages of extracts in our *Quarterly*. In our Quarterly, in our Conference, and in the Preachers' Meeting we earnestly, and at the risk of forfeiting our standing with our friends and the Church, fought with all our power against the doctrine and policy of "disintegration and absorption" as both unchristian and impracticable. "What!" it was replied, "offer terms of communion with the guilty Church, South! Look at her crimes. Two centuries of slavery blacken her skirts. She has sustained the human auction block. She has blotted out from her discipline all protest against what John Wesley called 'American slavery, the vilest system that ever saw the sun.' She has fiercely interdicted the liberty of speech; she has murderously denounced all opponents of slavery. To this she has added treason. There is scarce a man in her ranks not liable to a traitor's doom. And *has she repented?*" And now there is a much diminished number who say, "The Church South to this hour co-operates with all the wickedness of the secular South, in holding on to every remnant of oppression

as long as possible. She deals out to the negro, as the negro himself testifies, every species of lying and treachery. Not until she is forced by Northern pressure does she grant one additional prerogative of manhood to her oppressed colored people—and she does not *repent*." Dr. Myers will at once see that if it goes to drawing up lists of criminations, the North has quite the longest and largest in preparation. Rehearsal of grievances is generally an unsuccessful route to conciliation, and a very decisive indication that no conciliation is intended. To the whole our own reply has been, that guilty, awfully guilty, as the South has been, and still is, the North has been also guilty; that it is the frankly-given fraternal hand that most easily leads to repentance; and that the true way is to drop our charges against each other and both kneel down in repentance, side by side, leaving God to decide how great our respective sins and how possible our pardon. To this point the large body of our Church, we believe, have really come. But the leaders of the Church South are still counting up their charges: "You have done this and you have done that; and you must do this and you must do that, or we will not even fraternize with you." Heaven bless your dear souls, gentlemen of the Church South, we do not propose reunion because we *need* you. The Methodist Episcopal Church, in her clear, bright, well-read history before the acknowledging world, well knows that in offering to overlook your fearful history of sin, to cover your guilt with her comparative clearness, to sustain your weakness with her strength, and to lead you out from your outcast isolation into universal recognition, she is performing an act of high Christian magnanimity. The chief benefit would result to the Church South, to the general cause of Christ, to the peace of our common country, and, least of all, to us as a Church. She meant what you little deserve in hearty good faith. But when you put on airs, and bring charges, and prescribe conditions, as if you were the purists and the conquerors, you are simply giving evidence to the world that harmony is not your purpose.

In regard to our pushing upon the Church South, we early opposed our invading her in the spirit of "an ambitious ecclesiasticism." We advocated an earnest co-operation of both Methodisms, in a perfectly fraternal spirit, on the basis of the abandonment of all purposes of oppression, in the work of elevating the down-trodden, in binding up all wounds, and in restoring harmony, and, as far as possible, oneness to the two Churches. The "disintegration" theory defeated our counsels in the North. But they would have been just as completely defeated by the cruel and bitter

remnants of the old pro-slavery spirit in the South. Thus in our view, even since the war, there are an abundance of unchristian things, and things to be forgiven, on both sides. But, as a whole, *our Church was called of God into the South* in behalf of the oppressed. The Southern Church had no intention to lead her Southern blacks up into Christian manhood. She was not only false to her duty, but she meant that nobody else should perform it. Not until Grant's election did the South resign all hope of restoring slavery. What vexes Dr. Myers's soul is, that the Methodist Episcopal Church has, in spite of the Church South, carried education, freedom, manhood to the Southern Methodist negro. Dr. M. and his compeers "alone understood the negro;" and they purposed to train him, if not to slavery, yet to serfdom. Thus far our faithful Southern Preachers, our Conferences, our Bishops, our schools and high schools, have defeated their unholy aim and compelled them to higher grounds. But when the Church South gets rich, Dr. Myers assures us, she will take the negro out of our hands. Very well, Dr. Myers. When you outbid us in offers of franchise and elevation to the negro you are entitled to him. Your gaining of the negro will be the defeat of your own inhumanity; and you will have done the right not by the original promptings of your own Christian principle, but compelled by the Northern missionary and the Northern moneys against which you utter your *rabies*. Very possibly, but not very probably, our negro mission in the South will then have been *completely*, as it certainly will have been, on the whole, *nobly* performed. But, as we affirmed in our last article, until that time fraternization with the Church South is altogether subordinate to doing right for the negro South.

In the very act of disclaiming, the Editor unconsciously affirms, that there is a certain somebody, called "the South," who is to decide what man may reside in certain parts of our common country. The American Constitution declares that citizens of each State have all the rights of citizens in every other State. Of that article the old Slave States stood in permanent violation; and when Massachusetts sent Mr. Hoar to Charleston to test the matter by fair legal process, a Southern mob drove him from the city. The spirit of that mob still lives in that imperious "we," which, in the *Southern Advocate*, assumes to say who is "welcome" in the Southern part of our nation. The North has no such "we" deciding who may enter her limits. Of that old spirit the leaders of the Church South has, we fear, fully determined to make her the living embodiment. They are bent on cultivating the most in-

tense sectional temper. Loyalty, nationality of sentiment, patriotism, are repudiated as "politics." Their last General Conference was in the most fraternal spirit invited to pray with us for restored unity in heart of Church and nation; they returned a form of acceptance with *nation* omitted. They claim that this was a slip of the pen; but, alas! the *slip* has never been repaired. It was a typical omission forever unfilled. Study the columns of their papers, and you will look in vain for one spark of patriotism, one throb of exultation over the power and greatness of our reunited country among the nations of the earth. They are in heart and soul Southerners, but scarce Americans. The South is their sole country. Among the people these stubborn remnants of the old spirit will fast die away as fraternal fusion and commercial intercourse increase; among the leaders it will die when they die.

We know not what the Union Commission appointed by our last General Conference contemplates doing in view of the meeting, next spring, of the Southern General Conference, nor have we any advice to offer.* Our belief is, that it will be the desire of that body that its session should pass unnoticed by the Commission, and that it will take any proposition as inviting another glorious rebuff. Its real wishes, we think, will be two—that disunion may be permanent, and that the responsibility of disunion may be avoided.

Pamphlets.

The Constitution of Man and his Final Destiny. By JOHN K. FINLEY. Pp. 84. New York: Office of the Herald of Life. 1869.

The Judgment. Its Judicial and Executive Character, the Time and Manner of it. By GEORGE STORRS. Pp. 23. New York: Office of the Herald of Life.

God is Love. A Sermon by GEORGE STORRS. Pp. 23. New York: Office of the Herald of Life.

The Atonement of Jesus Christ—What is it? Pp. 96. New York.

The first of these pamphlets advocates, upon scriptural and other grounds, the doctrine of materialism, and the possibility of a future state only through a resurrection of the body. The second maintains that God's analytic judgment of men is in this world, but the executive judgment at the resurrection. By the former the wicked are condemned to bodily death without future

* Since the above was in type, we learn that Bishop Janes and Dr. M'Clintock will represent the Commission at that General Conference. They will doubtless be received with all formal courtesy; but, unless the spirit changes, there will be a pride taken in carrying out the smartness of their episcopal reply.

existence; by the latter the righteous are exalted to glory. The third maintains there is no hell, the only penalty of sin being non-existence by a resurrectionless death. The fourth maintains that the penalty of sin being bodily death, so the atonement was by Christ's bodily death through his shed blood.

Sunday-School Publications.

The Berean Lessons for 1870.—We chronicle with pleasure the widening and deepening interest in the Sunday-school branch of our Church work. We welcome especially the movements among modern and youthful Sunday-school men, which look to the study of the Holy Scriptures as the main object of this institution. We well remember the time when the committing of Scripture to memory was about the only thing contemplated by the Sunday-school, and have sometimes asked ourselves whether, with all the improved mechanical appliances of the age, the Sunday-schools of the present are really better than those of an earlier day.

The Sunday-School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church, through its Normal Department, is making a vigorous effort in the direction above indicated, and in the Berean Series of Lessons for 1870, published under its auspices, we see how thorough, radical, and practical the reform promises to be. Taking the Berean Synagogue (Acts xvi, 11) as a model, the system under consideration proposes to put the entire Church, old and young, in the family, pulpit, and school, at the daily study of the Word of God. The Berean Series is certainly very complete. Its lessons are chosen from both the Old and New Testaments. The first twelve are selected from the life of our Lord, the next twelve from the life of Elijah. A quarter's lessons with Peter, and another with David, complete the year's course of study. The following features of the system deserve especial notice and commendation:

1. The Lesson Manual contains Scripture lessons for the year with appropriate topics and texts, which contain the central truths to be taught. Each lesson is accompanied by a hymn which embodies its central truth. "Home Reading Lessons" are indicated for every day in the week. These are selected with reference to the topic of study for the ensuing Sabbath. By this arrangement the morning readings at family prayer are made tributary to the lesson of the Sunday-school. The "Lesson

Manual" contains sundry practical hints to both teachers and scholars, a map for reference, valuable tables, over forty first lines of familiar tunes to give the lesson-hymns a start, etc.

2. The Scholar's Leaf is a quarterly eight-paged tract with helpful hints, questions, etc., on the Berean Lessons, for pupils of all grades.

3. The Teacher's Leaf, containing forty pages, is also published quarterly, and is designed to assist teachers in the preparation of the same lesson. Each quarter is prepared by one of the following gentlemen: Dr. C. H. Fowler, Rev. J. M. Freeman, Dr. E. G. Andrews, and Bishop Simpson. Mrs. Emily Huntington Miller supplies infant-class suggestions, and Rev. J. H. Vincent illustrations for the use of all teachers. In addition to the Teacher's Leaf, editorial notes on the lessons are published in the Sunday-School Journal.

4. The Infant Class Leaf Cluster is a volume of forty-eight bold text and pictorial sheets, (each 24x36 inches in size.

5. The Picture Lesson Paper is an illustrated monthly for infant scholars. In this paper the Berean lessons are adapted to the youngest pupils.

We take pleasure in commending to the attention of pastors and superintendents this admirable series of lessons.

Miscellaneous.

Ancient States and Empires. For Colleges and Schools. By John Lord, LL.D., Author of the "Old Roman World," "Modern History," etc. 12mo., pp. 645. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

A Scripture Manual. Alphabetically and Systematically Arranged. Designed to Facilitate the Finding of Proof-Texts. By Charles Simmons. Second Stereotyped Revision. Thirty-sixth Edition. 12mo., pp. 750. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1869.

Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher. An Autobiography Edited by his Daughter. Translated by Rev. M. G. Easton, A.M. With a Preface by Rev. Prof. Cairns, D.D., of Berwick. 12mo., pp. 346. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1869.

The Sunset Land; or, The Great Pacific Slope. By Rev. John Todd, D.D. 12mo., pp. 322. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

Bound to John Company; or, The Adventures and Mishaps of Robert Ainsleigh. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 169. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Old Testament Shadows of New Testament Truths. By Lyman Abbott. With Designs by Doré, Delaroche, Durham, and Parsons. 8vo., red and gilt, pp. 213. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

A beautiful gift book, arraying rich truths in eloquent language and attractive externals.

Arms and Armor in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Also, a Descriptive Notice of Modern Weapons. Translated from the French of M. P. Lacombe, and with a Preface, Notes, and one Additional Chapter on Arms and Armor in England. By Charles Boutwell, M.A. 12mo., pp. 296. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

Among the Trees. A Journal of Walks in the Wood, and Flower-Hunting through Field and by Brook. By MARY LORIMER. With Illustrations from Drawings after Nature. 12mo., blue and gilt, pp. 153. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1869.

A beautiful New Year's gift.

A Collection of the Proverbs of all Nations. Compared, Explained, and Illustrated. By WALTER R. KELLY. 12mo., pp. 222. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1869.

The Pursuit of Holiness. A Sequel to Thoughts on Personal History, intended to carry the Reader somewhat further on in the Spiritual Life. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D. 12mo., pp. 261. New York.

Wild Sports of the World. A Book of Natural History and Adventure. By JAMES GREENWOOD. 141 Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 474. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Wedlock; or, The Right Relations of the Sexes, disclosing the Laws of Conjugal Selection, and showing who may and who may not Marry. By S. R. WELLS. 12mo., pp. 236. New York: Samuel Wells. 1869.

A Text-Book of Chemistry. Adapted to Use in High Schools and Academies. By LEROY C. COOLY, A. M. 12mo., pp. 221. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

A Greek Grammar for Beginners. By WILLIAM HENRY WADDELL. 12mo., pp. 104. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets. Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher. By EDWARD PAXTON HOOD. 12mo., pp. 453. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1869.

The Promise of Shiloh; or, Christ's Sovereignty upon the Earth, When will it be Fulfilled? By JOSEPH L. LORD, M. A. 12mo., pp. 106. New York: James Inglis & Co. 1869.

Lost in the Jungle. Narrated for Young People. By PAUL DU CHAILLU. 12mo., pp. 260, green and gilt. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Sorrow. By Rev. JOHN REID. 12mo., pp. 373. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Christ is Coming. Parts I, II, III, and IV. 12mo., pp. 254. London: John B. Day. 1869.

Shepherd of Israel: or, Illustrations of the Inner Life. By the Rev. DUNCAN MACGREGOR, M. A. 12mo., pp. 339. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Living Thoughts. Brown and gilt. 12mo., pp. 246. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1869.

Alone in London. By the Author of "Jessica's First Prayer." 12mo., pp. 187. Boston: Henry Hoyt.

The Minister's Wife. By MRS. OLIPHANT. 12mo., paper, pp. 199. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1869.

The Cloister and the Hearth; or, Maid, Wife, and Widow. A Matter-of-Fact Romance. By CHARLES READE. 12mo., paper, pp. 255. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

My Enemy's Daughter. A Novel. By JUSTIN M'CARTHY. Illustrated. 12mo., paper, pp. 162. New York: Harper & Brothers.

A Beggar on Horseback; or, A Country Family. By the Author of "Found Dead." 12mo., paper, pp. 124. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Wrecked in Port. A Novel. By EDMUND YATES. 12mo., paper, pp. 142. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Felix Holt, the Radical. By GEORGE ELIOT. 12mo., pp. 529. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

The Mill on the Floss. By GEORGE ELIOT. 12mo., pp. 464. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Hymns, Ancient and Modern, for Use in the Services of the Church. With Accompanying Tunes compiled and arranged under the Musical Editorship of WILLIAM HENRY MONK. 12mo., pp. 110. New York: Pott & Amery. 1869.

Hymns for All Christians. Compiled by CHARLES T. DEEMS and PHEBE CARY. 12mo., pp. 100. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1869.

Sabbath Songs for Children's Worship. By LEONARD MARSHALL, J. C. PROCTOR, and SAMUEL BURNHAM. Pp. 176. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1869.

Hitchcock's New Monthly Magazine. Choice Music, Art Notes, and Select Reading for the Family Circle. Pp. 32. New York: Benjamin W. Hitchcock.

The Silver Tongue and Organist's Repertory. Pp. 19. New York: E. P. Needham & Son. 1869.

Romola. By GEORGE ELIOT. 12mo., pp. 517. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

True Stories of Real Pets; or, Friends in Fur and Feathers. By GWYNFRYN. Beautifully Illustrated by F. W. Keyl, A. W. Cooper, and B. Rice. Red and gilt, square 8vo., pp. 179. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

How Charley Roberts became a Man. By the Author of "Forrest Mills." 12mo., pp. 256. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

How Eva Roberts gained her Education. By the Author of "Forrest Mills." 12mo., pp. 250. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

The Boy Farmers of Elm Island. By Rev. ELIJAH KELLOGG. 12mo., pp. 300. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Planting the Wilderness; or, The Pioneer Boys. A Story of Frontier Life. By JAMES D. M'CABE, JR. 12mo., pp. 256. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Dotty Dimple's Flyaway. By SOPHIE MAY. 12mo., pp. 200. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

Adventures on the Great Hunting Grounds of the World. By VICTOR MEUNIER. 12mo., pp. 297. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

Dame Nature and her Three Daughters. Translated from the French of X. B. SAWTINE. 12mo., pp. 267. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1869.

The Cabin on the Prairie. By Rev. C. H. PEARSON. 12mo., pp. 299. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Fault Finding, and Madeline Hascall's Letters. 12mo., pp. 249. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

The Discipline of Alice Lee. A Truthful Temperance Story. By ISA BELL. 16mo., pp. 248. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

The Young Detective; or, Which Won. By ROSA ABBOTT. 12mo., pp. 256. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

The Spanish Barber. A Tale of the Bible in Spain. 12mo., pp. 309. New York: M. W. Dodd.

The Doomed City. By A Presbyter. Pp. 13. New York. 1869.

Minutes of the First Sunday-School Convention. Held, under the Auspices of the Sunday-School Union of the Baltimore Conference, in the Charles-street Church, Baltimore City, October 19–22, 1869. Pp. 86. Baltimore: W. K. Boyle. 1869.

Second Annual Report of the Board of State Commissioners of Public Charities of the State of New York. To which is appended the Report of the Secretary of the Board. Pp. 220. Albany. 1869.

Hand-Book of Religious Instruction. Translated from the Dutch of J. H. MAUNIER, Preacher at Leyden. By FRANCIS T. WASHBURN. Part First, pp. 36; Part Second, pp. —. Boston: W. V. Spencer. 1869.

Postponed to Next Number.

The Principles of Logic. For High Schools and Colleges. By A. SCHUYLER, M.A. 12mo., pp. 168. Cincinnati: Wilson, Hinkle, & Co. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. New York: Clark & Maynard.

Gould's Development of Religious Habits. Appleton.

Millenarianism Refuted. Tibbals & Co.

Schuyler's Logic. Clark & Maynard.

Rambles through the British Isles. By Rev. R. HARCOURT. Tibbals & Co.

Horace. By LORD LYTTON. Harpers.

Tachygraphy. By LINDSLEY. O. Clapp, Boston.

PLAN OF EPISCOPAL VISITATION FOR 1870.

Conference.	Place.	Time.	Bishops.
North Carolina	High Point City	Jan. 6*	Janes.
Texas	Industry	Jan. 12	Scott.
South Carolina	Jacksonville, Fla	Jan. 20*	Janes.
Louisiana	New Orleans	Jan. 26	Scott.
Mississippi	Columbus	Feb. 3	Scott.
India	Bareilly, India	Feb. 9	Kingsley.
Liberia		Feb. 9	Roberts.
Lexington	Louisville, Ky	Feb. 24*	Thomson.
Baltimore	Frederick City	March 2	Ames.
Kentucky	Maysville	March 2	Thomson.
Virginia	Richmond, Va	March 2	Janes.
St. Louis	Springfield, Mo	March 9	Clark.
West Virginia	Charleston	March 9	Thomson.
Washington	Lynchburgh, Va	March 9	Janes.
Providence	Providence	March 16	Scott.
Philadelphia	Pottsville, Pa	March 16	Simpson
Wilmington	Port Deposit, Md	March 16	Janes.
Central Pennsylvania	Lewiston	March 16	Ames.
Missouri	Macon City	March 17*	Clark.
Pittsburgh	Johnstown, Pa	March 23	Janes.
New Jersey	Long Branch	March 23	Simpson.
Newark	Jersey City	March 23	Thomson.
New England	Springfield, Mass	March 23	Scott.
Kansas	Topeka	March 24*	Clark.
East German	Fortieth-street, New York	March 31*	Ames.
Nebraska	Fremont	March 31*	Clark.
New York	Thirtieth-street, New York	April 6	Thomson.
New York East	Seventh-street, New York	April 6	Ames.
New Hampshire	Nashua	April 6	Simpson.
North Indiana	Kokomo	April 13	Clark.
Central New York	Syracuse	April 13	Thomson.
Vermont	Springfield, Vt	April 13	Simpson.
Wyoming	Wilkesbarre, Pa	April 13	Janes.
Black River	Ogdensburgh, N. Y	April 21*	Ames.
Troy	Burlington, Vt	April 28*	Ames.
Maine	Augusta	May 4	Simpson.
East Maine	Rockland	May 12*	Simpson.
Germany and Switzerland	Carlsruhe	June 16*	Kingsley.
Colorado	Pueblo	June 23*	Ames.
Delaware	Cambridge, Md	July 21*	Scott.
Nevada	Virginia City	July 25*	Ames.
East Genesee	Elmira, N. Y	Aug. 24	Thomson.
Cincinnati	Piqua	Aug. 24	Simpson.
Oregon	Vancouver, W. T	Aug. 25*	Ames.
Detroit	Fentonville	Aug. 31	Clark.
Central German	Louisville, Ky	Sept. 1*	Simpson.
North Ohio	Ashland	Sept. 7	Thomson.
Indiana	Bloomington	Sept. 7	Simpson.
Michigan	Cold Water	Sept. 7	Clark.
Des Moines	Montana	Sept. 7	Janes.
Southeastern Indiana	Brookville	Sept. 14	Scott.
Central Ohio	Toledo	Sept. 14	Thomson.
Northwest Indiana	Terre Haute	Sept. 14	Simpson.
Upper Iowa	Cedar Falls	Sept. 14	Janes.
California	Stockton	Sept. 14	Ames.
Erie	Cleveland, Ohio	Sept. 21	Thomson.
Wisconsin	Janesville	Sept. 21	Clark.
Iowa	Albia	Sept. 21	Kingsley.
Tennessee	Nashville	Sept. 21	Scott.
Northwest German	Van Buren Church, Chicago	Sept. 21	Janes.
Southern Illinois	Lebanon	Sept. 21	Simpson.
Illinois	Shelbyville	Sept. 28	Kingsley.
Central Illinois	Pekin	Sept. 28	Janes.
West Wisconsin	La Crosse	Sept. 28	Clark.
Ohio	Logan	Sept. 28	Thomson.
Holston	Knoxville, Tenn	Sept. 28	Scott.
Southwest German	St. Charles, Mo	Sept. 28*	Simpson.
Rock River	Elgin	Oct. 5	Janes.
Minnesota	Owatonna	Oct. 5	Clark.
Genesee	Warsaw, N. Y	Oct. 6*	Thomson.
Georgia	Atlanta	Oct. 5	Scott.
Alabama	Branchville	Oct. 12	Scott.

* Thursday.

NOTE.—Bishop Kingsley also visits our Bulgarian and Scandinavian Missions, and also the British Conference and Irish Wesleyan Conference as the Delegate of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Methodist Quarterly Review.

APRIL, 1870.

Art. I.—GENERAL CONFERENCE OF 1844.

When Coke and Asbury began to give organic form to the Church "over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers," they found a large gathered flock in the Southern States. In that inviting and prosperous field a Gospel of perfect freedom had been preached by strong antislavery men, and accepted by slaveholders. The wrong of slaveholding had been a clear outspoken part of that Gospel, and while the humane spirit of many masters antagonized the spirit of slavery, and united with the formidable difficulties which society had opposed to emancipation to urge forbearance and delay, the *animus* of the system made it such an "enormous evil" that it was publicly condemned and marked for "extirpation." Orders were passed for what, under the circumstances, must be acknowledged as very prompt, decisive action—emancipation, withdrawal, or expulsion.

But slavery had become a cherished domestic institution, interwoven with the very framework of society, and was hedged about by laws which were evidently designed to make it an inseparable part of the State. The Church, therefore, found that it could be denounced; but then, and in the methods attempted, it could not be "extirpated."

In the meantime great revivals spread through the South, and the number of slaveholders in the Church, though relatively small, increased rather than diminished, as the law of

the Church assumed that it would and must; and whatever the inconsistency involved, it is simple historic fidelity to say that many of these men gave strong evidence of genuine piety. They wept and struggled in prayer for mercy, rejoiced in the evidence of pardon, were most humane in the treatment of their slaves, became zealous, flaming apostles of "Christianity in earnest," and many of them died in triumph.

An era of conservatism set in. It was intended firmly to antagonize the essential spirit of slavery, and only to tolerate the legal relation till God, in his providence, should open the way for emancipation. The conservatism of the Methodist Episcopal Church, therefore, represented mainly the extreme difficulty of administering her antislavery laws, and her strong desire to save the souls of the people, notwithstanding the impediments which slavery threw in the way. She meant, not endorsement, but toleration, under what was deemed exceptional circumstances; many of her clearest minds, North and South, insisting that there was an obvious distinction between the mere fact of slaveholding, which might be a legal, and even a humane, necessity, and holding as "chattels" the bodies and souls of men. It is in the light of this distinction alone that the apparently contradictory history of Methodism can be explained. But a deep sophistry and grave practical error came out of it. History ignored our distinction. The friends of the system, in growing numbers, claimed that in conceding the legal relation we conceded the principle, and the world at length agreed that the two should stand or fall together. Our Southern brethren, from an ostensible agreement with us, including the wrong of the system, passed at length to its indorsement as a great providential arrangement for social perfection; and not a few in the North joined in asserting that any ecclesiastical law requiring manumission was a direct assault upon the civil law, which could not be justified upon moral grounds, and at length the Church as such, in its administration, held its condemnation of *slavery* in abeyance, in consideration for the conceded rights of *slaveholders*.

In this condition of things Methodist conservatism gave large room to the growth of the connectional principle, which became more grasping and less scrupulous. It was agreeable to the Methodist Episcopal Church to be great. It must, indeed, be

conceded, however humiliating, that, over and above the zeal of Christian love for the souls of men, there was a human satisfaction in the popular power and spread of our beloved Methodism. Hence *we must not* run the risk of alienating the South. Many of our most earnest, eminent, and princely men were there; and, beyond a question, they were very thorough "old-fashioned Methodists," full of spiritual life and power, and uncompromisingly opposed to all departures from "the old landmarks." Our slaveholding members were, it was pleaded, legitimately in the Church; they were shielded by the law of the land, and we must, at least for the present, leave the matter of "extirpation" to God. Thus, in the judgment of many, the Church came into harmony with a great dominant political idea, Union first, principle afterward.

But a reaction was in progress. A new exposition of liberty was coming forward under the control of Providence. Since 1772 the great decision of Lord Mansfield, "that as soon as ever any slave set his foot upon English territory he became free," had been ringing in the ears of men. Since 1774 John Wesley's incisive "Thoughts on Slavery" had been working among the masses. The almost superhuman efforts of Thomas Clarkson, William Wilberforce, John Wesley, William Pitt, Lord Grenville, and their compeers, had rendered the year 1807 illustrious, by the legal overthrow in the British Parliament of "that execrable sum of all villainies, commonly called the *slave-trade*." This act made large rents in the vail which concealed the institution itself, to which this monster vice was only tributary. For twenty-three years this system of concentrated injustice had baffled the noblest philanthropy of the civilized world, in the most vigorous attempts to ameliorate the condition of its victims. In 1830 began one of those "ground swells" from English subjects, which, fortunately for human liberty, from the days of King John and *Magna Charta* no British "government" has ever been able to resist. To this grand conclusion the English mind had struggled up at last—slavery itself must be overthrown. Agitations, frightful to timid minds, swept through the realm; but Clarkson, Wilberforce, Buxton, Brougham, Lushington, Bunting, Watson, and their co-laborers, rising to the greatness of the occasion, controlled the

storm, and in 1833 Parliament proclaimed the will of British freemen in the great act of universal emancipation.

It is time now to remark that neither liberty, nor the work of liberty, is local. It is for no particular land or people, but for the world. The spirit of emancipation would of course cross the waters. It did not wait to complete its work in the British Empire before it came to America. It was here in the souls of Oglethorpe, Penn, Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Jay, Franklin, Rush, Benezet, Coke, Asbury, and a host of others. These were great, calm, reasoning philanthropists, and they "trembled for their country," because they "knew God was just." But the "agitators" were here also. George Thompson had agitated in England, and he would agitate in America. William Lloyd Garrison, Arthur Tappan, and their *confrères* would smite this giant enemy of the human race with blows that would reverberate throughout Christendom. If the Colonization scheme stand in their way, down with it. If the Church sought to throw the shield of conservatism around their victim, down with the Church. If the Bible was by construction a shield for the monster, away with the Bible. Orange Scott and his associates in Church, like other great radicals in State, cried out, in effect, up with the "tares," and never mind "the wheat." Fisk, Hedding, Whedon, and others, excited storms of wrath when they pleaded for "the wheat," for they seemed to protect the "tares" also. But at length the agitators were broken against the wall of conservatism. Outside, the Union rose up against them, and they dashed against the Union; but the Union was hard, and the recoil was destructive. In Church they struck the connectional principle and its highest representative the Episcopacy; but the Connection and the Episcopacy were firm, and the agitators seceded. In the meantime the deep growl of challenge, insolence, and angry menace of fierce resentment came up from the South. The calmest reason both South and North recognized the danger. Rumored insurrections were inevitably associated in the Southern mind with abolition fanaticism; and threats of disunion, with violence against persons and the press, followed.

The misrepresentations of facts and motives, the mutual hatred, and scorn, and wild excesses of those terrific days, have

no vindication in calm reason; but it would be untrue to history not to allow that agitation had its mission. It was time for inert, fossilized conservatism to be compelled to cry out "They that break in pieces have come hither also." The stagnation of society was breeding loathsome, moral pestilence. We have already traced the growth of expediency until, in ecclesiastical administrative law, it became too potential for clearly pronounced civil and Christian liberty.

One preliminary fact more must be stated, and then the exact *status* of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844 will distinctly appear. There was a large party, not very well defined, and entirely unorganized, in which many minds, North and South, seemed likely to meet. We mean those who wished to bring prudently forward the old hereditary antislavery doctrine of Wesleyan Methodism, and produce it to the point of emancipation in Church and State, and yet be thoroughly considerate with respect to men, and conservative with respect to institutions. They were, in fact, the true conservative-progressive section. These middle men held a firm opposition to slavery, ranging from the cool convictions of necessity to the utmost abhorrence possible to both sentiment and principle. They condemned the measures of extremists as unjust, disorganizing, tending directly to disunion in Church and State, and threatening a bloody civil war. They, therefore, instinctively crowded back the "ultra abolitionists" of the North and the "fire-eaters" of the South. They deliberately stepped between two blazing fires, and there the grand date-period of 1844 found them. They wished to calm the elements around them, arrest secession in Church and State North and South, resist the aggressions of the slave power, finally destroy it, and prevent the threatened horrors of fratricidal war. They were attempting—we now deliberately and mournfully say, they were *nobly* attempting—the impossible.

It should have been expected that the General Conference, to convene in Greene-street Church, in the city of New York, on the first day of May, 1844, would meet the slavery question in some new form. It had been possible to censure members for attending and speaking at "abolition meetings," and to condemn "colored testimony," but it would be so no longer.

The reaction was upon us, and the two spirits which had been aroused were aggressive. They would now certainly meet on a higher plane in the great argument; higher, but not very high, for the grave question, "What shall be done for the extirpation of the great evil of slavery?" had been in abeyance for thirty years, and would not be reached in thorough earnest for years to come. The questions—Was slavery sin *per se?* Was it unchristian in such a sense that it ought to disqualify a man for membership in the Church of God?—were kept sternly outside. But there was an old and very subtle distinction between slaveholding in the membership and in the ministry, which implied that there was a contaminating vice in it, unfit for the purest Christian functions; or at least, that there was a public sense, which would shrink from the ownership of human bodies and souls in those who taught Christian morality. There was some danger that this would be pushed aside to relieve the institution of the implied dishonor. Was the roused opposition to slavery strong enough to save this very humble *no* of Methodism? This would be tested. Rev. Francis A. Harding, of the Baltimore Conference, had been suspended for holding slaves. His appeal providentially forced the General Conference to answer. The contest, led on by Rev. John A. Collins, of Baltimore, for the old doctrine, and Rev. William A. Smith, of Virginia, for the new, and marred by no bad temper, was truly great. There was solemnity in this body of representative divines during the consideration of this question, for its far-reaching import was very evident. The Baltimore Conference, and the great traditional negative of the Methodist Episcopal Church, were sustained. That a Methodist traveling preacher cannot hold human beings as slaves, unless it be under an exceptional legal necessity, was the latest and most distinctly pronounced decision of one of the greatest voluntary Churches of modern times. But the discussion and the vote had been very significant. How far it would be an offense to our ministry in the South to be thus publicly and officially told that they could not be voluntary slaveholders, thus indicating that at least so much of antislavery law was not henceforth to be deemed a dead letter, could not just then be told. It was not likely that they would generally wish to be slaveholders, for the silent conviction that it was in some way incompatible with

the sacred office was still a strong self-assertion in the Southern Methodist ministry. But to be told, and that before the Southern public, by the highest authority of the Church, that they *could not* of their own will be slaveholders, and at the same time unchallenged heralds of the cross, was it not a grave interference with their rights, which they were bound to resist even to the extreme of renouncing the authority which should dare to assert it? "*Right* to hold slaves," "Our rights," "Vindication," "Renunciation," "Separation," these were the words and questions which gave solemnity and deep sadness to many noble men then sitting in the great connectional General Conference of American Methodism.

But there was to be another test of the strength of our historical limitations of a power which we could not destroy. Traveling preachers were responsible to Annual Conferences. It was possible that they might become mercenary slaveholders, and be screened by their respective Conferences. The General Conference could reach such a case only by appeal or by arraigning the Conference on the journal for alleged maladministration. But a Bishop is responsible directly to the General Conference. Could a Bishop be a slaveholder? The Episcopacy of Methodism is a unit in such a sense, that no matter how numerous the Bishops, nor where they severally reside, their jurisdiction is universal and one, as though they were but one man. Each Bishop is, therefore, the pastor or overseer of the whole Church. The question then was, Would the whole Methodist Episcopal Church, ministers and members, North and South, permit her general Superintendent to hold the bodies and souls of men in slavery, so that the mother and her descendants to the latest generation, should, by his voluntary act, be doomed to inevitable bondage?

It was now for the first time necessary, formally and officially, to settle this question.

Bishop James O. Andrew had become a slaveholder—in the mildest form and least offensive way let it be confessed—and yet, in law and in fact, a slaveholder; and the General Conference must determine whether this was a disqualification for Episcopal functions.

We had never had a slaveholding Bishop, and it may be demanded why? The answer to this question will not reveal

an accident, nor will it show a lack of opportunity, for it is now time to state that not only were traveling ministers in the South slaveholders, but among them were several of our most eminent men, either of whom would have brought to this high office all other requisite qualifications; but how could a great antislavery Church put the chief administrative authority of the discipline, bearing its most sacred traditional condemnation of slavery, pledging all proper endeavors to "extirpate it," nto the hands of a slaveholder? And how could any General Conference risk the shock to the moral sensibilities of the largest portion of the Church, and the destruction of public confidence which would follow? They could not, did not. The most considerate and far-seeing men in the South conceded this propriety. Hence they had made Joshua Soule, a Northern man, their candidate for Bishop, and elected him. In the same spirit they, in 1832, brought forward James O. Andrew as a capable man, free from the embarrassment of slavery, and he was elected. There is yet abundant living testimony to that fact. It was acknowledged. He was objected to by some of his strong pro-slavery friends for this reason. Dr. Elliott says:

Hence, in former days the most impartial men of the South and their friends declared that slavery could not be connected with the Episcopacy without untold mischief. Dr. Capers doubted even the heart of a man who should consent to be a Bishop, he owning slaves; and Bishop Soule declared before the Baltimore Conference, in 1844, that such a thing could not be. He has frequently said in the West, and once at least in our hearing, that a slaveholding Bishop was impracticable.

Numerous quotations to the same effect might be made. It must, however, be carefully noted that this feeling was far from being unanimous at the South; and if it was ever general, either as a matter of principle or of magnanimous concession to the antislavery discipline and feeling of the Church, it had ceased to be so. As early as 1836, in a famous private circular, Rev. William A. Smith, of Virginia, says:

It is true the Conference voted promptly against the wild schemes of the abolitionists. Unfortunately, however, it is equally true that a large majority voted on the principles of abolitionism in the election of Bishops, thus favoring the unrighteous prejudices of abolitionists, and proscribing from this highest office in the Church men admitted, in private conversations, to possess

superior qualifications to those appointed, simply because of their connection with slavery.

Again, in "The Sentinel," published by Mr. Smith, in harmony with this, if not from the same mind, we have:

But, alas! sir, before the adjournment, palpable evidence was given that those resolutions [against abolition movements] were gross dissimulations, and our fond hopes of unanimity and brotherly love were forced to give place to the strong and obvious conviction that proscription was the order of the day. The election of Bishops settled that point beyond a reasonable doubt. No one denied that the most prominent candidate of the South for the Episcopate was possessed of superior qualifications for the office over two of those elected; and because he was a slaveholder, this was disqualification enough. It was in vain that the Southern members warned their Northern brethren that this was a spirit of proscription, and that they could not submit.

This not only does historical justice to a minority whose opinions were becoming more and more evident, but it renders additional proof wholly unnecessary, that when the General Conference of 1844 came up to the question, "Does slaveholding disqualify a man for the Episcopal office?" the historical judgment of the Methodist Episcopal Church, unequivocally expressed during the entire period of its existence, answered, *It does.* There were, therefore, four great questions before the body: Was the General Conference right in this application of the antislavery principles of the Church? Should slaveholding, by marriage or otherwise, *after election*, as in the case of Bishop Andrew, be tolerated, when it would have been deemed an utter disqualification in a candidate *before election?* If so, then should the Bishop, who had, in full view of the facts, accepted this disqualification, voluntarily relieve the Church of this embarrassment? and if not, what method of relief would be lawful and expedient?

The statement of the argument upon the first question may be summary, and yet conclusive. The wrong of slavery is in the denial of the essential manhood of a moral being, created free, self-conscious, rational, immortal, bought by the blood of Christ, and held personally responsible, here and at the bar of God. The sinfulness of slavery is in the motive with which one man voluntarily holds another man, his brother, in legal bondage. The Church becomes *particeps criminis* when it

endorses the crime inherent in mercenary slaveholding, and gives voluntary support to a system vicious as a whole, and to laws framed and administered to protect, indorse, and perpetuate it. Unjust laws, which oppose insuperable obstacles to the just efforts of the Church to "extirpate the crying evil," afford no excuse for the toleration or the wrong in any respects not absolutely protected by the law in such way as to render it unassailable by the Church. The law in no way interfered with the right or will of the Church to keep its Episcopacy free from the "impediment" of slaveholding. The General Conference was therefore right in persistently refusing to the system the moral indorsement of tolerating it in its highest Church officer, comprehending the whole Church in his administrative jurisdiction.

The question next in order evidently is, Did the time and manner in which Bishop Andrew became a slaveholder make his case exceptional? The answer is, as it then was:

> What objection have we to the *election* of a slaveholding Bishop? None, surely, but what is based upon the idea of *having* one. Why do we, at the North, object to *electing* a man in such circumstances to the Episcopacy? For no other reason in the world than that we have no use for him when he is elected. He cannot be a true Methodist itinerating Superintendent. No, sir, it is not to *electing*, but to *having* one, that insuperable objections arise in the minds of Northern men. Need I apply these remarks? Can brethren fail to see that nothing more is needed to relieve us from our present difficulties than the legitimate action of the principles universally claimed by the North, and so extensively conceded by the South? No, sir, let it be distinctly borne in mind that the vote upon the present resolution must depend upon precisely the same principles as the vote for an election. We grant it is a much more *delicate* matter; so much so, indeed, as to almost appall the stoutest heart; but *the principle is the same, and the action must be the same.**

As the objection was not trifling, but most serious, no other view was possible. The argument, therefore, proceeded upon the principles involved; and the result showed plainly that, as before, so ever thereafter, *being* a slaveholder, without regard to the time or the manner of becoming so, was, and would be, an utter disqualification for the Episcopacy.

Then would Bishop Andrew resign? The great delicacy of

* Debates, 1844, p. 119.

this question made it difficult to introduce it; and yet the interests involved were so momentous that the minds of many turned anxiously to this as the only hope; and we have the most direct and conclusive evidence that Bishop Andrew would have resigned if it could have been left to him as a personal matter. He felt deeply the peril of the Church, and was anxious to make any sacrifice which his immediate advisers should deem right, to save it. In his address to the General Conference, May 28, he said, If he had offended the Discipline he was willing to resign, if by doing so he could relieve their difficulties. If he could secure the peace of the Church by resigning he would gladly do it. This matter is placed in precisely its true light by J. P. Durbin, G. Peck, and C. Elliott in their official reply to the protest of the Southern delegates. They say:

> For awhile the hope was entertained that the difficulty would be quietly removed by his resigning his office, which it was known he had previously desired to do. But this hope was dissipated by the intelligence that the delegates from the Conferences in the slaveholding States had been convened, and that they had unanimously advised him not to resign.

Evidently, against his personal inclinations, he had come to be the representative of the right of a Bishop to become a slaveholder, involving the position that slaveholding must not thereafter be held to disqualify any candidate for election; and further, certain leading friends of this position had fully determined that it should be indorsed by the representatives of the whole Church. It must, therefore, at least in one instance, be a qualification for the Episcopacy—a *sine qua non*. In 1836, Mr. William A. Smith, in his private circular, after explaining that the election of Bishops had been controlled by "abolition" principles, "proscribing" competent slaveholders, says:

> Will the Southern Church submit to this? Can they, in justice to themselves, submit to a continuance of this proscriptive system? They will not, they cannot.

Meaning plainly that the settled policy of the Church regarding slaveholding as a disqualification for the office of Bishop proscribes slaveholders, and must be abandoned; that the country could be settled only by admitting slaveholding in the Episcopacy; and now, by refusing to allow Bishop Andrew to resign,

the delegates of Southern Conferences moved directly up to this position. The issue was, therefore, as sharply defined as it could possibly be. It was approached with the utmost calmness and solemnity. There was no inconsiderate haste. Anticipating our sad approaching trial, a day of fasting and prayer had been appointed, and the whole Conference, with many tears, entreated God to avert the dangers which threatened our beloved Methodism. On the eighteenth day of May a deputation from an informal meeting of "twenty-two delegations from the North," including the venerable Nathan Bangs, Charles Elliott, George Webber, and Tobias Spicer, waited on Bishop Andrew, with the most brotherly purpose of ascertaining whether some method of safety could not be devised. But he remembered his representative position, and declined to receive or make any communication excepting in writing. With heavy hearts, these wise and noble men turned away, feeling that the hope of an adjustment was growing less. On the fourteenth our distinguished brethren, William Capers and Stephen Olin, in a carefully drawn preamble and resolution, moved the Conference to appoint a committee of six "to confer with the Bishops, and report as to the possibility of adopting some plan, and what, for the permanent pacification of the Church." William Capers, Stephen Olin, William Winans, John Early, Leonidas L. Hamline, and Phineas Crandall were this committee. They were men of prayer and of eminent wisdom. In the discharge of their grave responsibilities they were joined by our excellent Bishops; while the whole Conference, and uncounted numbers outside, waited with intense anxiety and prayed for their success. But on the eighteenth these ominous words fell from the lips of Bishop Soule:

> The Committee of Conference have instructed me to report that; after a calm and deliberate investigation of the subject submitted to their consideration, they are unable to agree upon any plan of compromise to reconcile the views of the Northern and Southern Conferences.

On Monday, May 20th, John A. Collins's resolution of inquiry into the facts in the case of Bishop Andrew went to the Committee on the Episcopacy. On the 22d the Committee answered "that Bishop Andrew is connected with slavery," and

submitted from him a frank statement in writing, which showed the manner in which he became a slaveholder. And on the same day the following preamble and resolution were presented by Alfred Griffith and John Davis, which, though superseded by another, we deem worthy of record here, because the long and familiar acquaintance with the history of the Church of these really great and good men gave it historical importance.

Whereas, the Rev. James O. Andrew, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has become connected with slavery, as communicated in his statement in his reply to the inquiry of the Committee on the Episcopacy, which reply is embodied in their report, No. 3, offered yesterday; and *whereas*, it has been, from the origin of said Church, a settled policy and the invariable usage to elect no person to the office of Bishop who was embarrassed with this "great evil," as under such circumstances it would be impossible for a Bishop to exercise the functions and perform the duties assigned to a General Superintendent with acceptance in that large portion of his charge in which slavery does not exist; and *whereas*, Bishop Andrew was himself nominated by our brethren of the slaveholding States, and elected by the General Conference of 1832, as a candidate who, though living in the midst of a slaveholding population, was nevertheless free from all personal connection with slavery; and *whereas*, this is, of all periods of our history as a Church, the one least favorable to such an innovation upon the practice and usage of Methodism as to confide a part of the itinerant general superintendency to a slaveholder; therefore,

Resolved, That the Rev. James O. Andrew be, and he is hereby affectionately requested to resign his office as one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Whatever might be thought of the wisdom of this proposed action, it had the advantage of being clear and direct, and within the undisputed rights of the body. But Bishop Andrew would not resign. As the representative of the right of slaveholding in the Episcopacy he could not.

We have now reached the last of our four great questions; What was it lawful and expedient to do?

He might have been charged with "improper conduct," tried, and if found guilty, expelled.

"To whom is a Bishop amenable for his conduct? Answer, To the General Conference, who have power to expel him for improper conduct if they see it necessary." Not from office

merely, according to the interpretation of Mr. Hamline, which is an accommodated and not strictly correct use of the word "expel," but from the ministry or the Church. We are driven to this latter sense by the history of the rule. It was adopted in 1784, and has never been changed excepting to put the word "General" before "Conference," and "Bishop" in the place of "Superintendent." The question as originally put was numbered 27. Question 25, in this immediate connection, asks, What shall be done in case of bankruptcy, involving dishonest accounts, and "that base practice of raising money by coining notes?" And the answer is, "Let him be *expelled* immediately." Answer 6 to question 24 is, "Extirpate bribery; receiving any thing, directly or indirectly, for voting in any election. Show no respect of persons herein, but *expel* all that touch the accursed thing." We cannot allow that the word *expel* meant entirely different things in these three closely connected parts of the same system of "Rules and Regulations." The uniform use of this term clearly determines the scope of prerogatives originally assumed and defined by the body of the Elders, and then by the delegated General Conference in the form of Discipline. Had Bishop Andrew been charged and tried under the intentionally general terms "improper conduct," the grade both of the offense and penalty must have been determined by the high ecclesiastical court, from whose decision there could have been no appeal. But no such charge was preferred; and it may be safely stated that the calm judgment of delegates did not indicate such a degree of severity, though the immediate friends of the Bishop insisted that formal trial under specific charges was the only method the law of the Church would allow.

This measure rejected, it was, however, competent in the General Conference formally to request Bishop Andrew to resign, as proposed by the resolution offered by Messrs. Griffith and Davis. But this was very distasteful to Southern delegates, and was strenuously resisted, as equivalent to a deposition and a final announcement of an unchangeable purpose that a slaveholder could not be a Bishop. It was felt that judgment must now be distinctly pronounced upon this issue; but there was a strong and sincere desire that the decision should be reached in the kindest possible manner; and, so far as the question concerned Bishop Andrew, it was now evident that a milder course

than that which was before the Conference was greatly desired, as this would conclusively remove him from the Episcopal office.

With the distinct intention of relieving the Church from the wrong and danger of slaveholding in the Episcopacy, and yet showing the desire of the General Conference to retain Bishop Andrew in office, free from this "impediment," on the twenty-third day of May the following substitute was offered by our distinguished brethren, J. B. Finley and J. M. Trimble, of Ohio.

Whereas, the Discipline of our Church forbids the doing any thing calculated to destroy our itinerant general superintendency; and whereas Bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery by marriage and otherwise, and this act having drawn after it circumstances which, in the estimation of the General Conference, will greatly embarrass the exercise of his office as an itinerant General Superintendent, if not in some places entirely prevent it; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment remains.

This substitute was manifestly accepted as expressing the firm purpose of the General Conference not to be responsible for "the enormous evil of slavery," in connection with the sacred office, but to relieve itself from this responsibility with the least possible injury to the Bishop and to our brethren in the South. This section is expressed in carefully studied words. It waived entirely the question of personal wrong in act and motive upon the part of the Bishop; it affirmed the incompatibility of slaveholding and its sequences with "the general superintendency;" it pronounced "the sense of this General Conference" that Bishop Andrew ought himself to relieve the Church of its embarrassment, not by resigning his office, and thus ceasing to be a Bishop, but by deferring the exercise of his functions until he should cease to be a slaveholder; and finally, it waived, for the time being, the exercise of all judicial rights in the premises; it provided no certain executive ministerial relief of the Church; it left to the Bishop himself the free choice between slaveholding, and the exercise of the Episcopacy, and to his own free determination whether he would acquiesce in "the sense" of the General Conference or not, and exacted no pledges of any kind. The question which arose after the passage of this substitute, as to

whether it was mandatory or advisory, was not discriminating nor learned. The act was neither a law nor a judicial sentence. It was an official decision, to the effect that slaveholding was an "impediment" to the *exercise* of Episcopal functions, and as such it was *authoritative*, not "mandatory." But if Bishop Andrew should decide that it was not authoritative, and determine not to *govern himself* by it, there was no provision made to enforce it; nor was the slightest penalty indicated. It was adopted on the first day of June, by a vote of 110 yeas to 68 nays. And on the sixth it was resolved, in answer to questions of administration asked by the Bishops, "that Bishop Andrew's name should stand in the Minutes, Hymn Book, and Discipline as formerly,"—"that the rule in relation to the support of a Bishop and his family applies to Bishop Andrew," and, let it be especially marked, it was

Resolved, That whether in any, and if any in what work Bishop Andrew be employed, is to be determined by his own decision and action, in relation to the previous action of this Conference in his case.

This was the final action relating to the Bishop in person, and not a word in addition is needed to sustain our entire theory of the result proposed and reached by the passage of this preamble and resolution, and its true meaning and intent. It was an official, authoritative decision by the supreme judicatory of the Church, waiving, for reasons of high discretion, all provisions for its enforcement. Hence a private fact which has nevertheless become history; the other Bishops made two provisional plans of Episcopal visitation, one *with* Bishop Andrew's name, to be used if he should elect to submit to this authoritative decision, the other *without* his name if he should determine to disregard it. Pending the vote on the Finley substitute, the Bishops had formally advised the General Conference to defer action on this case for four years. This advice was not accepted as a whole, because the crisis brought on by the action of Bishop Andrew, under the advice of the delegates from the South, demanded a solution. They would, therefore, make this an official decision, but all judicial rights were held in abeyance, in the interests of peace and charity; and if one man had so determined, the ministerial force of the decision would have been suspended, and the paternal council of the

Bishops to "postpone further action" until the next General Conference would have been, *in effect*, complied with.

But in the light of this analysis it is surprising to see how large a portion of the great discussion of 1844 was irrelevant. Strictly construed, the question before the General Conference was, a decision which must turn upon the historical principles and policy of the Church; but the grave question chiefly debated was, the power of the General Conference to summarily deprive a Bishop of official prerogatives simply on the grounds of unavailability. It may, however, be conceded that it was most natural, if not indeed desirable and inevitable, that the debate should take the wide range that it did, for the control of strict order would have left some questions of really graver importance, then actually pending, undetermined, doubtless to the permanent injury of the Church.

As a great forensic struggle, its real and relative *status* has been, without regard to denominational egotism, placed very high. It is not for us to pronounce upon this judgment. But surely a body under the presidency of Bishops Soule, Hedding, Waugh, Andrew, and Morris, including such men as Winans, Drake, Bascom, Capers, Bangs, Olin, Elliott, Collins, and Davis, dead, and many others living, whom, therefore, we do not name, could not want sincerity, breadth of view, strength of judgment, or forensic talent. It was morally impossible that they should agree, and chiefly because of their different stand-points, their associations, and settled habits of thought. Coming up to the question of right from one direction, what was more natural than that men who knew no other effective method of service or social system but what rested on the basis of slavery, should pronounce it no more wrong in a Bishop than in any other minister of the Gospel; in a minister than in a private Christian; and declare that there was a gross inconsistency in disallowing the convenience of slavery to a Bishop and granting it to other Methodists; and who can deny that they were right in this? No sound mind will set up the claim of historical consistency on the subject of slavery, either in law or administration, for the Methodist Episcopal Church. But it was not legitimate to argue evitable from inevitable concessions; nor the moral right of slaveholding in any man from the fact of slaveholding by

any number of men; nor from the character of any merely human laws. It *was* legitimate to deem slaveholding an assailable wrong in a high officer, for the disqualifications it would work, and require him to remove the disability or suspend the functions of his office, even though slaveholding in other men could not be successfully assailed. But let us solemnly admit the broader fact, that, under the control of Providence, we had reached the grand epoch in which concessions to slavery must pause, and the Church should calmly lead the State step by step back over the track of its concessions, and firmly reclaim the rights it had waived under control of asserted imperious necessity. Once started, the tread of liberty would be firm and irresistible, both in Church and State, back to "extirpation" and the inalienable rights of man. We stood up for long and weary days and debated the right to demand the pause which must precede our first timid step back toward first principles.

The powers and rights of the General Conference came thus into question. The right to "expel" a Bishop for "improper conduct" had, as we have seen, been framed into a general law, which certainly did not originate or impair the right, but simply asserted and very imperfectly defined it. But as no one proposed to apply this law in the present instance, and as it was charged that the measure before the Conference was a virtual suspension of Bishop Andrew without the formality of a trial, the right to suspend or remove a Bishop from office summarily, and simply upon grounds of unavailability, pushed itself prominently forward, and must, it seemed, be settled before the sense of this General Conference, or the official decision, should be pronounced.

This question really involved the whole polity and government of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Hence the wide range of the discussion, in which, if strict order made concessions, ecclesiastical science gained much more than ample compensation. But the consideration of two preliminary and decisive issues raised will be sufficient here. The first is a question of history.

The defense set up the claim that there was a "compromise law" on the subject of slavery, to which the Southern delegates in their "protest" gave this expression:

The Southern Conferences, in agreeing to the main principles of the compromise law, finally agreed to in 1804 and 1816, con-

ceded, by express stipulation, their right to resist Northern interference in any form, upon the condition pledged by the North, that while the *whole Church*, by common consent, united in proper effort for the mitigation and final removal of the evil of slavery, the North was not to interfere, by excluding from membership or ministerial office in the Church persons owning and holding slaves in States where emancipation is not practicable, and where the liberated slave is not permitted to enjoy freedom.

It was deemed a sufficient reply to this allegation that there is no historical evidence of its truth. It would seem, from the various statements made,

That the confederating Annual Conferences, "after a vexed and protracted negotiation, met in convention," and the section on slavery "was finally agreed to by the parties, after a long and fearful struggle," as a "compact," "a treaty," which cannot be altered by the General Conference until certain constitutional restrictions are removed.

The authors of the "Reply to the Protest" are confident that no transactions ever occurred which would properly admit of any such construction. They say:

If it had been the intention to guard the question of slavery by constitutional provisions, it would have been done when the Church actually did meet to form a constitution. But nothing of the kind appears. For when, in 1808, it was resolved that the General Conference, instead of consisting, as before, of all the traveling Elders, should be a delegate body, and when it was determined that that body (unlike the General Government, which has no powers but such as are expressly conferred) should have all powers but such as are expressly taken away; when this vast authority was about to be given to the General Conference, among "the limitations and restrictions" imposed *there is not one word on the subject of slavery; nor was any attempt made to introduce any such restriction.* The only provision anywhere established by that General Conference, of constitutional force, was the general rule forbidding the buying and selling of human beings with an intention to enslave them. So that, in direct opposition to the assertion of the protest, we maintain that the section on slavery is a mere legislative enactment, a simple decree of a General Conference, as much under its control as any other portion of the Discipline not covered by the restrictive rules. If additional proof of the truth of this position were needed, it might be adduced in the fact, that the section which the protest represents to have been settled in 1804 was not only altered at the General Conference or Convention of 1808, but also in the delegated General Conferences of 1812, 1816, 1820, and 1824. And although the protest speaks of it as "*usually known*" by the name of "The Compromise Act," the greater part of this

General Conference have never heard either that appellation or that character ascribed to it until the present occasion.

To this we only add, that there never had been any "high contracting parties" capable of making any such binding "compromise." The persons differing were inseparable parts of an organic unit, all alike bound by the official acts of the General Conference, and no other; while the historical character of all "rules and regulations" touching the subject of slavery, modified or repealed from time to time by vote of majorities, as necessity or discretion seemed to require, shows beyond all contradiction that they were not intended as fixed compromise acts, to be kept in the undeviating faith of "treaty stipulations," but concessions, for the time being, to be interpreted in the light of the general rule, and as soon as possible to be adjusted to the great historic purpose of extirpating the crying evil. There was, then, no "compromise law" to break.

The other great preliminary question raised was the character of Methodist Episcopacy. We were all, historically and by profession, LOW Churchmen. We accepted, from Mr. Wesley, Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church, and presbyterial ordination. We rejected "the figment of succession," and all ideas connected with the position that Bishops are, *jure divino*, a third order. If any thing was Methodism in Church polity, the *Episcopate is an office, and not an order*, certainly was. Fearing the tendency to prelatical pretensions, Mr. Wesley had insisted that our chief executive officer should be styled "Superintendent," and not "Bishop." In orders he was an Elder only; in office he was simply *primus inter pares*. He would, therefore, be *elected* by his peers, not *appointed* by any state or ecclesiastical authority; and as stability and safety must be combined in the exercise of his functions, the Discipline would be silent as to the duration of his term of office. By the fairest construction in the world, therefore, he held his office while he was available, and the power from which he received it would be the judge of the time when he should cease to exercise it. It was not, as we think, sufficiently exact to say, as was frequently said in this discussion, that he was simply "an officer of the General Conference." He was rather the officer of the whole Church, responsible to the General Conference.

The most plausible objection to this view was found in the

fact of distinct ordination. Here it may be confessed that Wesley, by retaining the separate forms of ordination for Deacons, Elders, and Superintendents, while he rejected as unhistorical the order of Bishops as distinct from Presbyters, handed down to us an embarrassing inconsistency. Our explanation is no doubt logically sound, as we insist that "the laying on of hands" is simply a form, primitive and apostolic indeed, which may be used as a solemn and decent method of investing with holy orders—a ceremony accompanying invocation or benediction, "the right of confirmation," or any other solemn official act of consecration. Or, as liable to abuse, it may be dispensed with. It is, therefore, perfectly safe to say, that in Episcopal Methodism the ordination of a Bishop adds nothing which affects any question of discipline. Whatever would be a lawful act of suspension, deposition, or expulsion, if a Bishop were constituted by election alone, is not rendered illegal "by the imposition of hands." But as neither the election nor ordination constituted an order, but both created an officer, it would have been in exact accordance with Methodist polity, as it was with the law of the Church, to have deprived Bishop Andrew of Episcopal functions without impeachment or trial. This was, however, as we have seen, neither done nor attempted; but simply *the decision was formally made that slaveholding was an impediment to the exercise of Episcopal functions, and the Bishop left to his own choice* as to which of the two incompatible things should continue. All judgment upon his decision was waived until it should be made, and the General Conference should be again convened.

This makes perfectly distinct the official grievance of the South in the case of the Bishop. Was it sufficient to justify a disruption of the Church?

Fidelity to history will show that it was not so considered by the Southern members of the General Conference. On the fifth day of June A. B. Longstreet presented the following declaration:

The delegates of the Conferences in the slaveholding States take leave to *declare* to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church, the frequent action on the subject in General Conference, and especially the

extra judicial proceedings against Bishop Andrew, which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from his office as Superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of this General Conference over these Conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding States.

This document was referred to a committee of nine, consisting of Robert Paine, Glezen Fillmore, Peter Akers, Nathan Bangs, Thomas Crowder, Thomas B. Sargeant, William Winans, Leonidas L. Hamline, and James Porter. It shows distinctly that the movements by Southern members, which looked to a division of the Church, were not based upon *any one act*, but upon the difficulties in which some attempts to make the antislavery doctrines of the Church practical had involved our Southern people, and it ought to be admitted that these difficulties were formidable, not alone because they were against a growing sentiment in the South that slavery was right, but because the purpose to protect it was profound and pervading in the Southern mind. We at the North had attempted in various ways to show that we were not insensible to the embarrassments which antislavery agitation brought upon our brethren there. But the day had come when high conservatism must give place to fundamental right, and however carefully and tenderly the assertion of this right had been adjusted to these embarrassments, they were felt by the men who must go back and labor there as by no others. To some men it appeared *then*, as it would to many more *now*, that it was the duty of our brethren boldly and calmly to confront these difficulties, and not only submit to the decision of the General Conference, but calmly and firmly defend the action of the Church. But we could not take the dimensions of the resistance to antislavery measures. We were sure that the action in the case of Bishop Andrew, was not "extra judicial" as alleged, nor in any sense judicial, but we could not tell what results the action taken, as interpreted by the South, would produce. The majority proposed to wait and see; but the minority indicated positive convictions that the recoil would be irresistible and destructive. They therefore addressed themselves immediately to what they deemed their absorbing question of self-protection. The first formal proposition came from Dr. Capers June 3d. In six carefully drawn resolutions it proposed, by the consent of the Annual Conferences, to erect

two General Conferences, one South, the other North, with distinct jurisdictions, but one Church. These resolutions were respectfully referred to a very able committee, consisting of W. Capers, W. Winans, T. Crowder, J. Porter, G. Fillmore, P. Akers, L. L. Hamline, J. Davis, and P. P. Sanford. After two days' deliberation Dr. Capers returned these resolutions stating that "the committee could not agree on a report which they judged would be acceptable to the Conference."

The next measure was a resolution, offered on the fifth day of June, by J. B. M'Ferrin, of Tennessee, and T. Spicer, of Troy. The exact wording of this famous resolution, as it was presented, amended, and passed, is not shown by the Journal. As it stands, (p. 111,) it reads,

Resolved, That the Committee appointed to take into consideration the communication of the delegates from the Southern Conferences be instructed, provided they cannot in their judgment devise a plan for an amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing in the Church on the subject of slavery, to devise, if possible, a constitutional plan for a mutual and friendly division of the Church.

But the resolution as presented proposed to obtain, upon the contingency named, the direct authority of the General Conference for the division of the Church. The writer of this article promptly and energetically protested against its passage, insisting that we were sent to conserve the Church, not to divide or destroy it. If division occurred, it must be entirely at the responsibility of those who effected it. If the South should assume this responsibility he would treat them kindly as to joint and separate interests; but never on any account should the Methodist Episcopal Church indorse or become responsible for the division. A spirited debate sprang up, which was terminated as follows: "Mr. Hamline rose, and being too weak to speak loud, walked from his seat in the side to the central aisle, and said, 'I cannot go out with such instructions.' Being urged to go, he said, 'I will not go out with instructions from this Conference to devise a plan to divide the Church.' 'Then will Brother Hamline go if the instructions be so changed as simply to read, if the South should separate, to make provision in such a contingency to meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity?' Mr. Hamline said, 'I will go out with such instructions.'" *

* Life and Letters of L. L. Hamline, D. D., pp. 165. 166.

The writer distinctly recollects that Mr. Hamline put his suggestions into words, instructing the Committee "to inquire whether there be any constitutional method of dividing the funds of the Church." The suggestion was accepted by Mr. M'Ferrin, and after failure of a motion by T. Crowder to strike out the word "constitutional," the resolution as amended at Mr. Hamline's suggestion, and by consent of the mover, was adopted. But by some mistake it went into the journal with the words "division of the Church," instead of the words adopted by the Conference. It must be presumed that the words orally suggested were not put into the slip of paper containing the resolution, and the Secretary failed to catch them. But the only legal importance this famous resolution ever had was due to this mistake. Mr. Hamline went into committee under the instructions actually passed, and not those which appear in the Journal, drawing up the substance of the famous report of the Committee of Nine, "*carefully guarding every word*, as 'separate' and 'separation,' instead of 'divide' and 'division,' and providing the submission of the restrictive rule to the Annual Conferences as in his judgment a constitutional method of 'dividing the funds of the Church.'"

Of course, the Journal as approved is official; but the moral value of the true history, given above, is in the clear evidence it furnishes that the General Conference did not intend to originate or sanction the division.

"The protest of the minority" was presented on the sixth day of June. The most important points of this document have been already considered. The only remark necessary here is, that it distinctly indicated the conviction that a separation was inevitable. The argument was adjusted to this idea, and hence its moral effect was not to avert the disaster, but to aid in producing it. The official reply was opposite in all respects. They could not be alike. Their difference was much more a reason for sorrow than for surprise or reproach. But both could not be right. If the General Conference was wrong, then slavery was right, not only in a Bishop, but in every body else, and might now be restored without injustice to the enslaved. Providence has settled the question between us

Art. II.—POLITICS AND THE PULPIT.

National Sermons. Sermons, Speeches, and Letters on Slavery and its War: from the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill to the Election of President Grant. By Gilbert Haven. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1869.

It is one of the favorable signs of the times that evangelical sermons, in periodical or book form, find such a wide circulation in our country. It betokens not only an elevation and refinement of literary taste, and an increasing interest in religious truth, but also that the pulpit is steadily advancing in influence over cultivated minds. To the question why the Methodist Episcopal Church has not a share in this species of literature, proportional to the number and talent of its ministry, we may give several answers. In the first place, that ministry have been trained to aim at immediate results. Their pulpit preparations, therefore, having reference chiefly to this very desirable end, have been of a synoptical and fragmentary character, suited only to extemporaneous preaching. Again, through fear of sermon reading in the pulpit, elaborate sermon writing has not been encouraged by our denominational fathers. Our peculiar Church polity, favoring the repetition of the best pulpit productions, the preacher has been inclined to withhold these from the press till he should be laid aside from the active duties of the sacred office. But in old age the eye is too dim to decipher the hieroglyphics of the youthful pen in its eager haste to keep pace with the rushing stream of thought. The literary executors order the manuscripts to be sold to the paper-maker. Thus many of our most gifted preachers pass away, leaving, as their only literary monument, a thanksgiving or fast-day sermon in the perishable form of a pamphlet, or the still more ephemeral newspaper.

Mr. Haven has very wisely become his own literary executor, and, by causing some of his best pulpit utterances to crystalize into the solid form of a beautifully executed volume, has contributed to supply what was lacking in the literature of his own Church; and he has become the historical representative, to all coming generations, of the work that the American ministry wrought in the long, dark, and bloody struggle of the State with oppression and rebellion. This volume is the only

monument in book form of the large share which the loyal pulpit contributed to the redemption of the Republic. It is exceedingly appropriate that this memorial should belong to that branch of the Church which, in the words of the martyred President, "contributed more soldiers to the army, and more nurses to the hospitals, than any other." He might have added, "and more words of cheer from her preachers in the darkest hours of the nation." We hail with pleasure this volume of National Sermons on account of their historic value. The future historian will see in them the steady growth of the national conscience on the question of slavery through the most important period of that baneful institution. These Sermons are historical pictures, not drawn by the pencil of a professed historical painter, but photographs imprinted by the events themselves upon a highly susceptible Christian soul. Before he was an editor in the sanctum he was an editor in the pulpit, showing "the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure." Philosophical history, which discloses the secret causes of great events, delights also to present the process by which these causes wrought out their effects. These Sermons reveal, in the experiences of a single mind, the process by which the mighty moral forces of Christianity slowly upheaved the foundations of a hoary iniquity. They will be witnesses to future generations that to Jesus Christ belongs the victory over American slavery, and not to a Christless Rationalism. The weapons of this warfare were chiefly not carnal, but spiritual—even the word of the Lord, the sword of the Spirit. And when at last carnal weapons were employed to decide the great moral debate, and cannon-balls took the place of words, the loyal pulpit steadily upheld the cause of freedom. The wonder of future generations will be at the strength of that irresistible tide-wave of popular feeling which lifted up and carried along on its bosom legislatures, congresses, cabinets, armies, and the President himself, through years of disaster and despair. That wonder will cease only when the sermons preached through all the loyal States shall be read by the historian, and the religious character of the conflict shall be discovered, of which the Spirit of God, through the agency of the pulpit, was the very creator and life. The millions of freedmen now emerging from the dark prison-house of enforced ignorance

will read these Sermons—the evangels of liberty—with intense interest and satisfaction, after having the gospel of slavery—"servants obey your masters"—perpetually dinned in their ears. The true Christians among the former slaveholders themselves will find the silent utterances of their own consciences eloquently voiced in the bold denunciations of that institution with which they were once implicated. Even the slave-traders and rebels of former days will have a natural curiosity to see the enginery which hurled its deadly bolts at the grim Moloch whom they worshiped, and which consumed him in his own fires. They will find the "National Sermons" the best specimen of an abolition battery.

The prophetic character of these discourses will attract the attention of the Christian philosopher. In every Sermon, even in "The Death of Freedom"—the passage of the Nebraska Bill—in "The State Struck Down"—the assault upon Charles Sumner—and in the "National Midnight"—the election of James Buchanan—there are the clearest predictions of the immediate downfall of Slavery, while, in the capture of John Brown, he sees the "beginning of the end."

In 1856 he asserts that "if we postpone our political reformamation to the presidential contest of 1860 there will be civil war." In December, 1859, on the day of John Brown's execution, he used these words: "Ere long slavery will lose Waterloo. *Within this first century of our national life it will disappear. Then will all men unite in praising this Samson who first tore down the pillars of this soul-devouring Dagon.*" In 1860, on the election of Abraham Lincoln, he predicts "The bell that rang out the first birthday in the ears of all the nations, will ring out its first centennial with the prophetic words inscribed upon it, *Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land to* ALL *the inhabitants thereof*—no longer prophecy to be accomplished by a long and perilous and bloody path, but blessed, unchanging history." So marvelously have these prophecies been fulfilled, that we should be tempted to the skeptic's resort of asserting that the prediction was made after the events, did we not know that the author was incapable of such an act, and, moreover, that these predictions were printed at the time of their utterance. We would ask the

disbeliever in the prophecies of the Bible whether, in view of the fact that a great truth gave such an elevation to an uninspired human intellect, the Spirit of truth may not lift the soul to those serene heights whence the future events of the world's history may be clearly discerned?

Their rhetorical excellence is another notable feature of these Sermons. In the first, entitled the "Higher Law," delivered in Amenia, where the author was teaching, his style is less popular. He approaches his theme as if before a class in ethics, on the metaphysical side, developing the Higher Law from an examination of man's moral nature, just as Sir W. Hamilton bases the proof of the existence of God upon the existence of mind in man. But all the subsequent Sermons, though burdened with thought, go straight as an arrow to the heart of the people. If he ever falls into a metaphysical train of thought, in the language of Dr. Olin, he "makes his metaphysics luminous." He has a fine perception of resemblances, and hence, like his great Master, his Sermons abound in "likes." His style is enriched with lustrous and precious gems gathered from the whole range of English poetry; yet every gem is chosen, not for its brilliancy, but for its incisive diamond point, wherewith to engrave his earnest thoughts upon the hearts of his auditors. He has attained the mastery of the "art of putting things." He is a true lover of Nature, and a strong poetic vein runs through all his writings. In descriptive power he is the Thackeray of American Sermon writers. In the statement of a truth and the enforcement of a duty there is a luxuriance of historical illustration arising from the preacher's perception of the same principles appearing in various guises from age to age. In the blood of Charles Sumner shed on the Senate floor, he sees the blood of the man Jesus Christ shed in essentially the same cause by the same malignant and tyrannical spirit. In the Charlestown Court-house, where John Brown was arraigned before a slaveholding jury, he sees the mockery of the Gabbatha. This power of discovering what Plato calls the τὸ ἕν in the τὰ πολλά, the one in the many, is a striking peculiarity of Mr. Haven's intellect, and explains the freshness and richness of his style. His soul takes fire at every form of injustice; but in his hottest denunciations he combines the fearlessness of John Knox with the tenderness of John of Patmos. Though he

speaks on the most exciting themes he employs no invective, betrays no bitterness, always chooses hard arguments instead of hard words, and ever

"Hates the sin, and yet the sinner loves."

If a vigorous and commanding, rather than an "imbecile," pulpit is the demand of the age, we know of no modern model of sacred rhetoric more inspiring of the spirit of Christian manliness than these Sermons.

Their most striking characteristic is their evangelical philanthropy. Their author is deeply impressed with the sacredness of man. His education in Boston, a city eminent for its advocacy of human rights; the influence of the eloquent and philanthropic Channing over all highly cultivated minds; his fondness for Wordsworth, the poet of the lowly; his studies of Wesley, and the antislavery Methodist fathers, all contributed to inspire in him a love for man, especially for the oppressed, which betrays itself on every page of his writings. The philanthropic element of Christianity, so prominent in the labors of Wesley and in the eleemosynary appeals of Whitefield, has perceptibly declined in modern Methodism. In disproving the charge of her Calvinistic opposers that she taught justification by works, she very naturally has leaned in the opposite direction. It is also a natural result of the prominence of the doctrine of justification by faith, that the second great commandment of the law should be correspondingly depressed. Every age which succeeds a restoration of evangelical doctrines needs its St. James to correct the abuses of the Pauline statement of Gospel truth. Our National Preacher is the St. James of modern Methodism magnifying the works of the law of love as an indispensable proof of the genuineness of the believer's faith in Jesus Christ. He earnestly denounces respect of persons in the Christian Church—the preference of men not on the ground of characters divinely transfigured, but for the accidents of rank, wealth, nationality, or color—substituting for the ring-fingered and goodly appareled, the white-faced man; and for the poor man in vile raiment, the dark-skinned and woolly-haired brother in Christ. He demands that all distinctions containing the least shadow of a reproach or intimation of inferiority be done away in the Christian Church. "We must expunge the word 'colored' from our Minutes," said he in 1863.

"Suppose an unfortunate dwarf should join this Church, and the Pastor should return three hundred full grown adults and one dwarf." "What a torrent of indignation would be poured on our Missionary Board if they should publish in their East India returns their Brahmin and Pariah members in separate columns!" This usage of the Methodist Episcopal Church disappeared by order of the General Conference the following year, to the loss of the statistician, but to the honor of the Church, and to the relief of sensibilities needlessly wounded. But the National Preacher is not satisfied with this. He insists on the abolition of all distinctions among Christians arising from nationality, color, or condition. The negro pew, the African church, the colored conference, must all be swept away, as offensive to the Head of the Church, who prays for the oneness of his members, and who abhors all distinctions among his disciples not founded on character. From the earnestness and eloquence of his plea for the extinction of caste in Church, in State, and in social life, and from the constant reiteration of this duty, we infer that the preacher has a burden from the Lord, a "woe unto me" if I preach not this Gospel. To men of cooler temperament, and narrower range of vision, who have not conquered their prejudices by the growth of a broad and evangelical philanthropy, the preacher may seem to be tithing the mint and cummin to the neglect of the weightier matters of the law, and to be magnifying out of proper proportion the comparatively harmless American usage of studiously and scrupulously separating themselves from their sable fellow-men. The brotherhood of man, bruised, fettered, despoiled, and vilified through the long ages, but elevated and crowned at last in the coronation of Christ his elder brother, is not an affair of the mint and cummin character, but in the spirit which it inculcates, and the purpose at which it aims, it takes on a significance broad as the human race, and high as that throne which redeemed men are to share with the God-man. There must be a radical defect in that form of Christianity which can be contemptuous to a black saint and complimentary to a white sinner. There must be a strange obtuseness of moral perception in that Christian who does not discover that this is the very sin portrayed and condemned in the Sermon on the Mount, "Whosoever is angry with his

brother *without a cause*, shall be in danger of the judgment." We believe with Mr. Haven that this feeling of caste is not only marring the beauty of American Christianity, and creating schisms in the body of Christ, but it is poisoning its vital currents and corrupting its very heart. The preacher very clearly sees that the social equality of the African with the Caucasian involves, as a possible result, an amalgamation of the races. He is not the man to evade the logical consequence of his doctrine, but he boldly accepts and justifies it. In his sermon on "Caste, the Corner-Stone of American Slavery," he says:

> So when you ask us if we believe in the intermarriage of the races, we answer, True marriage is a divine institution. Such hearts are knit together by the hand that originally wove them in separate but half-finished webs. God makes this unity. If he does not, then it is a conventional, human thing, subject to the whims of human society. As it respects such marriage, (between white and black,) all I need to say is, It is none of our business. It is the business of the two souls that are thus made one by the goodness and greatness of their Creater. If heart is one with heart, then with Shakspeare must you say,
>
> "Let me not to the marriage of true souls
> Admit impediment."

That greatest of poets and thinkers carries this principle to its fullest expression in the marriage of the most womanly of his women and the most manly of his men. He sets the loves of Desdemona and Othello far above the range of groveling criticism.

If we cannot accept this doctrine, consistency requires that we make a bonfire of St. Paul's speech on the Areopagus. The whole question of marriage is to be left to those mysterious affinities which bring together true lovers in holy wedlock. These should not be prevented by social ostracism, or by unwise and unrighteous legislation, and be driven into criminal relations. The disastrous consequences of such unwarranted interference with the natural course of human affections are thus set forth by Mr. Haven: "Said a clergyman to Mrs. Johnson, the God-given wife of Vice-President Richard M. Johnson, 'You cannot join the Church, because you have not been married.' She told her husband what had been said to her. He replied, 'Tell your minister, my dear, that I am ready, and always have been, to be publicly married, and ask him to come and marry us this very night.' The clergyman dared not do his

duty, even at the request of one so high in station. Thus he kept a Christian woman from the Church for a sin which he and his Church fastened upon her. No wonder that her husband, in his official career, hurled indignant epithets at the Church, and died without its pale."

This justification of the intermarriage of the two races, dwelling upon the same soil, enjoying the same civil, and soon to enjoy the same political rights, ought not to shock American Christians; and it would not, had the deeply-rooted and wicked prejudice which slavery has fostered been plucked, root and branch, from our hearts. Many of the readers of these National Sermons, though unable to answer the preacher's cogent argumentation on this whole question of caste, will, nevertheless, insist that he has transcended that law of righteous expediency announced by St. Paul, "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient;" and by a greater than Paul, in these words, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." These persons would have us abstain from the proclamation of the whole truth till the dawn of the millennium—till sinful prejudice has died a natural death. But this denunciation of caste is just the truth which is most imperatively needed for hastening the glorious era of universal righteousness. Especially do the exigencies of the times in our own country, when we are laying anew our religious, social, and political foundations in a large portion of our republic, demand a full exhibition of the scriptural doctrine of the oneness of mankind in Adam and in Christ, and the enforcement of all the duties which are founded on this great truth. To wait till prejudice dies before applying the antidote, is to wait till the antidote is useless. But the prejudice of caste is a demon which must be cast out of the American heart by the repeated exhibition of its repugnance, not only to Christianity, but to our boasted principles of equality and popular sovereignty. It will never die—the euthanasia of nature; it must be slain by the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. One of the clear marks of the divine origin of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is its recognition of a law of progress in human society. It descries a glorious future of intelligence, liberty, and purity, and draws the race toward it. Unlike all pagan systems, its golden age is in the future and not in the past. Toward that age it teaches every

believer to look while he utters the prayer, "Thy kingdom come." The spirit of caste is in direct antagonism to this law of progress, repressing a portion of the race from rising to better conditions, keeping them as near as possible to the brute, whose instinct is distinguished from reason chiefly by its incapacity to improve. The caste feeling manifests itself in the disturbance of those divine adjustments of society which we call laws of political economy. It forbids the development of natural diversities of taste and genius, by denying the appropriate conditions, and by excluding from proper spheres. Ericsson's mechanical ingenuity, Peabody's mercantile sagacity, the eye of Raphael, the hand of Phidias, the imagination of Shakspeare, the tongue of Demosthenes, the generalship of Napoleon, and the statemanship and patriotism of Washington, if found within the proscribed circle of caste, must all be rudely crushed down into that menial occupation which the iron despotism of caste shall dictate. Says the sacred ordinance of Menu, "No collection of wealth must be made by a Sudra, even though he has the power, since a servile man who has amassed riches gives pain even to Brahmins. If a Sudra reads the Beids of the Shaster, or if he offers to give instruction to priests, let hot oil be poured into his mouth and ears." The House of Commons petitioned Richard II. "that villains might not, for the honor of freemen, be put to school, and so get on in the Church." Thus a stagnant state of society is produced, in which millions of minds vegetate without hope of ascending a single step; all invention is impossible, and new arts and new operations can have no place, because there can be no more minute division of labor corresponding to the multiplying wants of an advancing society, for unalterable castes and changeless occupations must go together. The mechanics' unions, the boards of trade, the professional schools and associations, all obey the ordinance of Menu, and oppose an insurmountable barrier to that law of human progress ordained by the Creator and reaffirmed by the Redeemer. The same spirit is repugnant alike to Christianity and to American principles, inasmuch as it is an insuperable obstacle to the administration of equal justice, the very purpose of human governments. Says John Stuart Mill, "In societies in which caste or class-distinctions are really strong—a state so strange to us now, that we seldom

realize it in its full force—it is a matter of daily experience that persons may show the strongest sense of moral accountability as regards their equals, who can make them accountable, and not the smallest vestige of a similar feeling toward their inferiors who cannot."* "Never shall the King," says one of the ordinances of Menu, "slay a Brahmin, though convicted of all possible crimes; let him banish him from his realm, but with all his property secure, and his body unhurt." During the reign of Henry II. in England, in all cases of secret slaying, whether of English or Norman, the penalty was to be levied on the hundred, "unless there are plain *indicia* of the servile condition of the deceased." But we need not search the ordinances of Menu, nor the laws of the feudal ages, for proofs that caste ever wars on justice. The statute books of nearly every State of our country, and the records of every court of justice before which Africans and Caucasians have appeared, afford glaring evidence of injustice done to the race deemed the inferior. That caste violates the great law of love, the law by which men are to be judged, is too evident to need proof. "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it not unto me." It is not so evident, yet, nevertheless, is is true, that the existence of a strong class-feeling is a constant source of a fatal theological error—the denial of the unity of mankind. Wrong feeling is a standing menace to right thinking—to theological orthodoxy.

> "Faults in the life breed errors in the brain,
> And these reciprocally those again.
> The mind and conduct mutually imprint
> And stamp their image in each other's mint."

American Christianity, through the prevalence of caste-feeling, has advanced to a practical, and, in some instances, to a theoretical denial of the fundamental truth of the unity of the race, in the face of the plainest declarations of the Holy Scriptures, which have been made void by the ingenious sophistries of time-serving divines, and of science, falsely so-called. It is one of the brilliant revelations of modern philology that the whole cast-iron system of castes in India, which claims to be founded on their most ancient religious books, has grown up in opposition to the very letter and spirit of those books, by a series of

* Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, vol. ii, p. 289.

interpolations and corruptions made by the caste which has had their exclusive possession. The ordinances of Menu are a later invention than the Vedas, which are recognized by the Brahmins to be the most ancient and authoritative of their sacred books. Since the Vedas have come into the possession of occidental scholars, it is found that there is not a vestige of authority in them for the complicated system of castes, for the offensive assumptions on the part of the Brahmins, and for the degradation of the Sudras; and that there is no authority to prevent the social intermingling, and even the intermarriage, of the classes whose touch is now esteemed polluting; and the British government might to-day decree the annihilation of this entire scheme of oppression, appealing to their highest authorities to prove that it is no part of the religious system of the Hindus. The priestly caste, like the Jewish elders and papal corrupters, have made void the law through their traditions. To this error caste always tends. The only safeguard is to put away the abomination wherever Christianity holds sway.

But the philanthropy of these Sermons is very far removed from that pseudo love of man which prompts its professors to show their hostility to man's Divine Saviour by blasphemously baptizing their children in the name of the Universal Brotherhood, as some German infidels have done. In every Sermon Christ is exalted, not merely to give a Gospel flavor to a political harangue, but as the corner-stone of the temple of humanity. The oneness of man in the person and work of the God-man is the burden of every Sermon. The cause of the slave before emancipation, the cause of the outcast since that event, is the cause for which He now intercedes. The African is the purchase of his blood, and the representative of the Man of Sorrows; and our treatment of him is the test of Christian character.

It was this large element of evangelical philanthropy in these National Sermons, and the intense religious earnestness of the preacher uttering the convictions of his moral nature, from a point of view infinitely above the partisan politician, which rendered them means of grace to the hearers, and promotive, and not obstructive, of revivals of religion, in the midst of which many of them were preached.

We cannot dismiss this topic without a criticism on the posi-

tion of the preacher in his sermon entitled "World War," and in the extended note thereon in the appendix. We note that his intense philanthropy, bursting the limits of patriotism, has carried him into a wide divergence from the ideas and traditions of the best American statesmanship with respect to our foreign relations. Mr. Haven would have the United States abandon the Monroe doctrine, and intervene in every struggle for liberty throughout the world, not merely by her moral influence and expressed sympathy, but by casting her sword into the scales, and destroying that studied balance of power which is another name for the league of the world's crowned heads against the development of popular liberty. He says:

> This doctrine (neutrality) has been a chief source of evil to ourselves, and to our cause at home and abroad. It was a departure from principle under the guise of selfish policy. It was the first temptation and the first fall of the American nation, and the prolific parent of all our woes. The sword has been found two-edged, and the stout British arm has made it cut deep into our vitals, as our youthful arm did into that of the more youthful French Republic. . . . That neutrality (at the outbreak of the French Revolution) destroyed our friends and multiplied our enemies. No less than six Republics, the fruit of our loins, have we sacrificed to this mistaken policy.

He gives a history of the rise of this doctrine—which he styles "the very gospel of selfishness"—in the second term of Washington's administration, originating with Hamilton against the protest of Jefferson, who had proclaimed "the gospel of humanity" in the Declaration of Independence. He characterizes the Farewell Address as "cold, and unworthy of the great soul that penned its sentences; and far below the highest statesmanship is this statement of the relation of great powers to each other."

To these strictures of our National Preacher on Washington's doctrine of neutrality we answer, that neither the Gospel of Christ nor the gospel of Republicanism can be promoted by invading armies of foreign soldiers. Each nation, like each individual, must work out its own salvation. Our own Republic would have been born, perhaps not quite so soon, without Lafayette as an accoucheur. There were also, in the case of our fathers, prudential reasons for neutrality toward the first French republic. They had just emerged from a long and

wasting war, with a bankrupt treasury, and without a navy and army sufficient to cope with the powers of Europe allied against the French Republic. A man, wounded and faint from loss of blood, may express the liveliest sympathy for his brother sinking in the waters before his eyes, while he refrains from a plunge which he knows must be suicidal. We justify the Father of his Country, and thank God that so steady a hand was on the helm of our government in that critical hour. He was too unselfish to float along in the current of the popular enthusiasm; but he resisted that current, and put his administration into the minority in the next Congress, preferring temporary unpopularity for himself to permanent injury to his country.

Nor can we agree with the Preacher in his declaration that England's neutrality during our late civil war was of a character like that which we maintained toward France in her struggle with European despotism. Of the latter he says:

> But while the people were willing, another spirit ruled the government. It hastened, with equal zeal and alacrity, to identify itself with the enemies both of the country and its principles. The doctrine of neutrality was then born into the political world —a cup that has since been faithfully commended to our unwilling lips by the power that then won the chiefest benefit from its creation. How perfectly the type and the antitype agree. England's course toward us is exactly copied after that which we pursued against the French Republic.

We have read history in vain if this statement accords with the facts. We have yet to learn that Washington's neutrality toward France was a thinly disguised hostility, exhibiting itself in rejoicing over the defeats of the French armies, and in permitting Alabamas to be fitted out in our ports under the British flag to prey upon French merchantmen, and that the United States accorded to the English vessels of war privileges in American ports which were denied to the French.

Mr. Haven eloquently portrays the indignities heaped upon America in the day of her recent troubles.

> The recital of the acts in which the feelings of the British aristocracy found expression would be longer than that in which our first Congress indicted its King. Before a battle had been fought, even before an army on either side had been gathered, it took every possible step to insult, weaken, embarrass, and destroy

our government, except that of active hostilities, and this was withheld only from fear of civil war at home. It sheltered piratical steamers in its harbors; and when our vessels of war lay in wait for them in the channel it put its men-of-war under their bows, with directions to blow them out of the water if they presumed to obey the orders of their government. And this, too, not in British waters, but upon the high seas.

Can the Preacher truthfully substitute America for England, and France for America in this passage? Yet all this must be shown to be true in order to make the historic parallel complete. We earnestly hope that the author will, in his future edition, revise the note in which these statements are made, and that he will permit no declaration to stand which cannot be verified by stubborn historical facts. But the reader will gladly pardon whatever of extravagance or error there is in this note, after reading the eloquent and bold rebuke administered to England in the Letter to the London Watchman, the first half of which caused such a commotion that the managers forbade the publication of the remainder, although it was already in type.

We had intended an extended argument, not on the duty of the Christian minister to carry politics into the pulpit, but to carry the pulpit into politics, but we find this argument so much more tersely stated in the "National Sermons" that their author shall be heard in justification of his own course.

> What does God keep mankind on earth for? Only that he may build them into a holy temple in the Lord. But is one part of the temple open to the feet of his servants, and not another? Laymen could not enter the holy of holies; but priests could go every-where, from the court of the Gentiles to the altar and ark. So is this great temple of humanity open to inspection, under the surveillance of the ministry and the Church.

Then follows a series of historic proofs of the above statement.

> More than once did the Hebrew kings seek to break away from the intermeddling of the clergy; but God smote the politician and not the prophet. . . . Saul meddled with Samuel's duties, and God took his kingdom from him. But Samuel was never censured for his intermeddling with the affairs of Saul. David had to submit to the authority of more than one priest. No priest was ever compelled to silence before him. Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Hosea, Amos, all the preachers of righteous-

ness, dwelt on social and civil sins. They dwelt on hardly any thing else.

His answer to the reiterated declaration that the Christian minister should have for his only business the preaching of Christ crucified is on this wise:

> What matters it that you gather round the flag if you desert the outposts? Wellington was defending London when campaigning in the Peninsula. So is it with the Gospel of the Cross. Christ crucified is the grand banner of the Church in its conflict with the world. It must be always and every-where defended. But to come and hug that flag-staff with apparent fondness, while the enemy is plowing the outer lines with diabolic artillery, is not affection—it is cowardice; and the officer who thus comports himself receives contempt, not commendation, from his Master. Take your flag with you, and rush thither. Smite down the foe in this remotest assault, and you preserve your army from more central peril.

In the sermon entitled "Jefferson Davis and Pharaoh," the preacher has made a valuable contribution to polemical theology by the manner in which he has illustrated the relation of man's rebellious will to the Divine purposes. Assuming that God's great design in the American civil war was emancipation,

> Three difficulties stood in the way: the words and construction of the Constitution, the aversion of the North to abolitionism, and the purpose of the South to prevent it. Each of these seemed strong. All must yield, or be crushed to powder beneath His omnipotent march. How can they be removed or reduced? Only by strengthening the last. . . . For this purpose He raised up their strong leader, and endowed him with extraordinary nature, in order that against His will these fears and prejudices of the nation might be dashed to pieces, and our glorious end be sublimely accomplished.

He then demonstrates the freedom of both Pharaoh and Davis in their resistance to the appeals of God. Neither was conscious of any constraint upon "his will to any course other than it freely and enthusiastically accepted as its highest, strongest, only choice." He then shows that, in accordance with the laws of mind, the will is strengthened by exercise. Had either of these tyrants "yielded honestly but a little, they soon would have yielded all. Their resistance intensified resistance, so that by the laws of their nature, that is, by God the

Creator and Sustainer of all law, they both hardened their hearts, and yet God hardened them also. He allowed those natural laws to work their perfect work in them." Hence, Davis clung to independence against all entreaties to make a compromise, till the Southern Confederacy fell, and he became a fugitive. This entire historical parallel is in a style of thrilling eloquence, exhibiting the fine analytical and descriptive powers of the writer.

Art. III.—ROMANISM AND THE COMMON SCHOOL SYSTEM.

Popery dissolves under the influence of American institutions and ideas. Years ago Bishop England, of Charleston, S. C., deplored this fact, in his correspondence with the Leopold Foundation, from which funds have been so largely drawn for Papal propagandism in America. The Romanist journals incessantly discuss the fact. Occasionally an American convert, like Father Hecker, boasts of the progress of Popery here; but his shrewder brethren rebuke his exaggerations, and show overwhelming proofs to the contrary. "There never was a greater error," says the "Western Catholic;" "true, millions of Catholics, flying from misery in the Old World, have taken refuge in the New, and their millions of offspring now cover all the land. But this is a loss to the Church, not a gain; for two thirds of them are lost to their faith. There are ten millions, at least, of persons in these United States, born of Catholic parents, who are now heathens. There are said to be five millions still faithful to the faith of their fathers. The natural increase of Catholic population, in this country, is more than one hundred per cent. in a generation. If the same causes which are at work now continue, that one hundred per cent. will be lost to the Church as sure as it will come." The Catholic journal of Philadelphia, "The Universe," makes similar statements, and numbers the annual loss of Catholic children in New York city by tens of thousands.

Few, if any of these losses, can be attributed to direct Protestant efforts—to conversions from Popery. They are the

result of indirect national influence. The first generation of the children of Catholic immigrants adhere, more or less, to the Church; the second generation are scarcely found at its altars; the third generation are irrecoverably lost in the mass of liberalized American citizens. Papists are every-where about us; they are in all our houses, like the frogs of Egypt, but the process of Americanizing goes invincibly on; and the Church population does not keep pace with that of the nation, nor with that of Protestanism, nor with that of some individual Protestant denominations. Popery once possessed Canada, Maryland, Florida, and Louisiana—the old Louisiana from New Orleans to St. Louis. Now Protestantism predominates in all those regions. In most of them Methodism alone is numerically stronger than Romanism. The former has, to-day, more churches in Baltimore (founded by Catholics) than the latter. According to the official census, from Washington, it has in the Republic more church accommodations, (sittings,) it has also a much more numerous clergy, and a larger population.

It is, then, an incontestable fact that Popery, as an effete or medieval system, is incompatible with the advanced thought of this country, and, therefore, in spite of its indefatigable exertions, and its accessions by immigration, it melts away under our civilization as the icebergs from the Pole dissolve when they get into the Gulf Stream. It is an exotic, and cannot thrive in our soil.

One fact tells fatally against it: it cannot raise up here an indigenous priesthood. Its young men become too much Americanized to be willing to enter numerously the ecclesiastical office with its celibacy, its hierarchical, un-American restrictions, and its medieval ideas and habits. Hence it must continually recruit its priesthood from Europe. How can such a Church succeed among the American people? What would become of any leading Protestant denomination—Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, or Episcopalian—were it dependent perpetually on an outlandish clergy? Could it be a power among the American people, who are so egotistically yet nobly national? Young Catholics become, we have said, Americanized here, and that means Protestantized. The process of this change, this assimilation, is not, we reaffirm, in any direct proselyting influence of Protestant Churches. It is chiefly in the Common School System

of our education. It is there that intellect, aspiration, consideration, self-reliance, self-determination, are awakened. The enlightened citizen ceases to be the subjected Papist. There never has been, perhaps, in the history of the world, a more effective example of quiet, pervasive, invincible civilizing power than that presented in the American Common School. It is, as Burke called Chivalry, "the cheap defense of nations." The American Common Schools are the cheap and chief fortifications of the Republic.

The astuter, leading minds of Popery in America, have not failed to perceive this potent influence of the Common School. They acknowledge, at last, that they can no longer stand before it. Popery or the Common School must go down. There is absolutely no other alternative. Nearly all these men are foreigners, as are most of our population who still remain subject to their sway. To attack a public interest so dear to the national heart, so prized by the national intelligence, as the Common School, would be a delicate, perhaps a dangerous, experiment. They have, therefore, been very measured, very gradual in their opposition. They first required the expurgation of our text-books. Some of us remember this stage of the controversy in New York city. They have opposed the use of the "authorized" English version of the Bible in the schools; Cincinnati has excluded it, and the opposition is appearing in Pittsburgh, Chicago, and other places; we cannot doubt that it will extend over the country. In this movement they have had the co-operation of all opponents of the Christian Scriptures—the Jews, German Rationalists, skeptics, and the non-religious population of the country generally. But its success has emboldened them to disclose their real intent, namely, the destruction of the whole Common School System. Their opposition to the Bible was but tentative—a pretense. They now hesitate not to avow their hostility to the entire public education. They were supposed to be hostile to Protestant or sectarian partialities in the schools, and their hostility seemed plausible; but it is now seen that they are positively contending for sectarian, for ecclesiastical, education. The Jews, the German Rationalists, the non-religious population of the country generally, sided with them in their opposition to the Bible from hostility to sectarian education; but now that it has become

obvious that they assail the entire Common School System—that their ultimate aim is the substitution in its place of a more intensely sectarian system, an ecclesiastically controlled system, a Papal system—these non-Protestant auxiliaries cannot co-operate with them; they must necessarily fly to the opposite flag. And if the question becomes a party-political one, as seems inevitable, these allies will prove unavailable to the Papists. It will become a contest not only between Popery and Protestantism, but between Popery and the nation; between a non-American, a foreign hierarchy, on the one hand, and the American people, including Protestants, Jews, German Rationalists, and the non-religious population generally, on the other; a controversy over a fundamental, indefeasible condition of the national liberty and the national life. For no maxim in social and political life has been more completely demonstrated than that popular liberty, popular government, cannot co-exist with popular ignorance. Popular sovereignty essentially means popular intelligence and virtue. As the intelligence of the citizen is necessary to the very life of the State, these commonwealths have provided, at the expense of millions, for the common education of their juvenile population. To deny this right of the State is to deny its right to exist. The American people will summarily decide any question which touches its national life. There can be no doubt, therefore, of the issue of this contest if the controversy is rightly managed. So far as its ecclesiastical bearing is concerned, there is one Protestant denomination which alone is numerically competent to confront the Romanists, and it will not fail to do so, should the struggle go on. Its clergy and journals are now summoning it to preparation for that struggle; and in less than three months it will, we predict, stand ready to a man for the uncompromising defense of this great national interest.

We need hardly pause to prove that the contest has assumed this new aspect; that it is no longer a question of Bible or no Bible in the schools, but a question of Common Schools or no Common Schools. The avowals of the Romanists on the subject are explicit and quite universal. Purcell, the Cincinnati prelate, has avowed their position to the Board of Education in that city. Archbishop M'Closkey has declared it: "I can answer," he says, "that, so far as our Catholic children are con-

cerned, the workings of the Public School System have proved, and do prove, highly detrimental to their faith and morals." A Catholic authority, in Boston, asserts in the "Advertiser" of that city, that "Catholics would not be satisfied with the Public Schools even if the Protestant Bible and every vestige of religious teaching were banished from them. . . . They will not be taxed either for educating the children of Protestants, or for having their own children educated in schools under Protestant control."

The "Tablet," of New York, states the whole Papistical theory of the subject, by asserting that "education itself is the business of the spiritual society alone, and not of secular society. The instruction of children and youth is included in the sacrament of orders, and the State usurps the functions of the spiritual society when it turns educator. The secular is for the spiritual, is subordinated to religion, which alone has authority to instruct man in his secular duties, and fit him for the end for which his Creator has created him. The organization of the schools, their entire internal arrangement and management, the choice and regulation of studies, and the selection, appointment, and dismissal of teachers, belong exclusively to the spiritual authority."

The "Catholic Telegraph" says, "It will be a glorious day for Catholics in this country when, under the blows of justice and morality, our School System shall be shivered to pieces."

The "Freeman's Journal" says, "Let the Public School System go to where it came from—the devil. We want Christian schools, and the State cannot tell us what Christianity is." "This country has no other hope, politically or morally, except in the vast and controlling extension of the Catholic religion." And it exclaims, "*This subject contains in it the whole question of the progress and triumphs of the Catholic Church in the next generation in this country.* Catholics! let us all act together! Let us all read and listen to the same sentiments, that we may know how to act together!"

The Romanist journals of the country are generally rife with such declarations; they are utterances of ecclesiastical barbarism amid American enlightenment and liberty. Their recent boldness has rendered their opinions distinct and intelligible to the American people. For years they have been vague, but

growingly emphatic. Archbishop Hughes made formidable efforts to impair the Common School System in New York city. For nearly half a century the struggle went on, till, in 1869, the Romanist party "succeeded in getting a single section inserted in a general law embracing various subjects, under which this denomination has received from the public treasury a sufficient amount to pay the salaries of all its clergy in the city for 1869."* This desecration of the public money, consecrated to education, is chiefly attributable to the management of Mr. Tweed, who, in the Senate of the State, has tried for some time to get set apart, for Roman Catholics, a portion of the School Fund, but failing in this, succeeded, with the co-operation of other politicians, the last year, in "inserting in the city Tax Levy a clause giving over $200,000 to sectarian schools; and having secured this, they were able to procure the selection of a person to divide this sum, who—waiting until the State election had passed, so that the public might not be offended at a critical moment by his apportionment—gave to twenty-five Roman Catholic schools $153,800, and to twenty-eight Protestant schools $61,107."

The Act by which this bad deed was done provides that "an amount equal to twenty per cent. on the Excise moneys received for said city in 1868, shall be distributed for the support of schools educating children gratuitously, *who are not provided for in the Common Schools.*"

The Act is of permanent application, the appropriation being not dependent on the Excise receipts, but only rated by those of 1868.

This abuse of the public money could be hopefully, and ought to be immediately and sternly, contested in the courts. The appropriation is for schools educating children "not provided for in the Common Schools;" but are not all the children of the city so provided for? The Special Committee, appointed by the Board of Education, September 15, 1869, say in their Report of October 6, 1869: "The Committee caused to be made a thorough examination into the seating capacity of the school buildings in the city of New York. The average attendance for the year ending December 31, 1868, was 86,154, while the number of seats is 125,987, showing an excess of seats over the

* Hiram Ketchum, Esq., in New York Evening Post for January 17, 1870.

average attendance of 39,833. This clearly shows that no additional school buildings will be required during the year 1870, and for some years to come." According to this statement, the 20,000 children, in these aided sectarian schools, are amply "provided for" by the 39,833 vacant seats of the Public Schools of the city. The distributor of the funds, under the new Act, has, therefore, rendered himself liable to the charge of maladministration.

The proofs that this misappropriation of the public funds—the hard-earned and over-taxed money of the people—is a Papistic measure, are too glaring to be denied; they are *prima facie*. It is but one in a series of misappropriations which has extended through years.

In 1846 the city government of New York gave to the Romanists, for one dollar, four hundred and fifty feet (450 feet) of the Fifth Avenue end of the block of ground adjoining the last and between Fifty-first and Fifty-second streets; and then in 1857, for one dollar a year rent, gave this sect the rest of this block; thus practically donating the whole block running through from Fifth to Fourth Avenues, which block is now estimated to be worth a million and a half dollars, ($1,500,000.)

In 1852 they gave to the same sect the fee of a whole block of ground running from Fifth to Fourth Avenues, and from Fiftieth to Fifty-first streets, by changing a lease into a fee, for the sum of eighty-three dollars and thirty-two cents, ($83 32;) and then, in 1864, paid the same sect twenty-four thousand dollars ($24,000) for the privilege of extending Madison Avenue across this block; and also made this sect a donation of eight thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight dollars and eighty-four cents, ($8,928 84,) to pay all assessments on the block for opening Madison Avenue. A moderate estimate of the present value of this block of ground is one million and a half dollars, ($1,500,000.)*

In 1863 were distributed to religious bodies $105,000; of this sum $97,500 were given to Roman Catholic, while but $7,500 went to Protestant institutions.

* "Abstraction of Moneys from the Public Treasury for Sectarian Uses," published by the New York Union League, 1870, and signed by Prof. Francis Lieber, as Chairman of Committee.

In 1864 $70,000 were given to the Romanists; in 1865 $100,000.

In 1866, out of $129,025 appropriated by the State, $124,174 were given to the Romanists; all except $4,851.

In 1867 the Legislature gave $80,000 to the Society for the Protection of Catholic Orphans, and in the same year the Common Council of the city gave $120,000, most of which was appropriated to the Romanist Schools.

Besides the enormous sum given from the city treasury to this denomination in 1869 for schools, other sectarian appropriations were made amounting to more than half a million,* ($528,742 47,) and of this aggregate the Romanists received the egregiously disproportionate share of $412,072 26, leaving for the Methodists less than $3,075, for the Baptists less than $3,000, and for all Protestants but $116,680 21.

These are startling facts. They should rouse the whole patriotic population of New York. A more flagrant abuse never arrested the attention of our citizens. "It began," says the New York Union League, "under the specious form of begging from the city treasury a few dollars for some deserving charity controlled and owned by some one of the several hundred religious sects into which our people are divided. It has in a few years made such gigantic strides that it now *abstracts from the city treasury, of the money raised by general taxation, half a million dollars annually, and uses the greater part of this sum to destroy our system of Public Schools.*" We have been virtually endowing Popery in New York city. *De facto* we have here a union of Church and State, for Romanism has become practically a politico-ecclesiastical institu-

* Of the appropriations made in 1869, the following are the figures, showing the total amount voted to each sect:

Roman Catholic	$412,072 26
Protestant Episcopal	29,335 09
Hebrew	14,404 49
Reformed Dutch Church	12,630 86
Presbyterian	8,363 44
Baptist	2,760 34
Methodist Episcopal	3,073 63
German Evangelical	2,027 24
Miscellaneous	44,035 12
Total	$528,742 47

tion among us; it not only usurps our municipal powers by its intolerable corruptions at the polls, but it appropriates to itself our public treasury, and meanwhile fills our prisons, pauper houses, and other charitable establishments.* The appropriations of the city government "to certain religious sects, and their peculiar institutions," says the Union League Committee, "exceed those of any other city in Christendom." The small proportional Protestant appropriation, in these instances, is but a disguise of the real intent of the unpatriotic management which originated the misappropriation.

Most of the Romanist institutions receiving this aid are educational establishments, and their use of the public treasury is, throughout, an indication of the hostility of Romanism to the American Common School System. This hostility is inherent in Romanism. In the famous "Syllabus" of the reigning Pope, education by the State, aside from the Church, is expressly denounced. That barbarous document has shocked the moral sense and the common sense of Europe. It strikes at almost every essential principle of modern civilization, but at none more fundamental than this. Meanwhile Europe is practically repudiating this ecclesiastical interference with so momentous a guarantee of national well-being—of national existence. Even Austria, under the reform policy of Count Beust, has thrown off the Concordat, and wrested her education from the control of the Papal priesthood. Italy itself repels it. England, heretofore without a national system of education, after wasting millions for sectarian schools, finds this policy insupportable, and is rapidly advancing toward independent, impartial State education. Shall the New World retrograde before the Papal hierarchy at this

* The "New York Herald" gave, lately, the following list of city appointments held by Romanists: "The Sheriff, Register, Comptroller, City Chamberlain, Corporation Counsel, Police Commissioner, President of the Croton Board, President of the Board of Aldermen, President of the Board of Councilmen, Clerk of the Common Council, Clerk of the Board of Councilmen, President of the Board of Supervisors, five Justices of the Courts of Record, all the Civil Justices, all but two of the Police Justices, all the police court clerks, three out of four Coroners, two members of Congress, three out of five State Senators, eighteen out of twenty-one members of Assembly, fourteen out of nineteen of the Common Council, and eight out of ten of the Supervisors! The Papal Church thus controls in New York city, first, the taxation of city property; and, second, the appropriation of the millions of revenue received from taxation."

hour of the emancipation of this greatest State interest in Europe?

The Roman hierarchy among us demands this abject submission of American public opinion. Its prelates are now in Rome, prepared, as we all know, to sustain the Syllabus of the Pope in its proscription of impartial State education. They have taken their stand in the line of the Ultramontanists, and, ignoring their national relations, and the profoundest sentiments of their assumed country, they array themselves against the liberal Catholics of France, Germany, and Hungary, who would withstand the barbarous policy of the Vatican. They will vote for the condemnation of our Common School System, given in the Syllabus, and return, armed with the fiats of the Pope and the Council, to wage final war against it. The attacks upon it, within a year, have been but preliminary to this inevitable result. These prelates are mostly foreign-born; they are politic men; and they have a definitive policy on the subject. A great—not merely an ecclesiastical, but a national—contest is impending over us, and we must immediately prepare for it.

Nor is it a question of our Common School System merely. It goes deeper than this. It strikes at the very foundations of our commonwealth, of our national liberties and life. Popery is hierarchical in ecclesiasticism, and monarchical in politics. The first fact presupposes the second. Nothing is more repugnant to it than the American theory of popular sovereignty. But the American theory of popular sovereignty is the latest, if not the last, expression of civilization, in political philosophy. It implies the independence of Church and State, universal toleration, the responsibility of the individual man to God alone for his religious opinions. It asserts for the individual man the prerogative of unrestricted scientific inquiry in regard to religion, morals, social and political order, and all things else in the universe of God; and it asserts this right to be essential to the true, the normal development of humanity. Popery knows well that it cannot stand before this glorious freedom of man. It belongs to an effete epoch. It is out of joint with modern thought and modern institutions. It must conquer or die; for it cannot reform, and conform to modern thought without ceasing to be Popery. How can these hier-

archists, these medieval ecclesiastics, consent to die, after controlling Christendom for more than a thousand years?

The civilized world, therefore, beholds to-day with astonishment the greatest anachronism in history—a gorgeous hierarchy, headed by a tri-crowned Pope, sitting under the most magnificent roof of Christendom, and babbling in a dead language over theses which have been confuted and outsped by our civilization for generations; babbling about the "Assumption of the Virgin;" the passage out of the world, without natural death, of Mary—a notion about which Holy Scripture says not a word, and at which common sense revolts; about the personal "infallibility" of the Popes—men, some of whom take rank in all moral flagrancies with the worst Cæsars recorded by Suetonius and Tacitus—who have contradicted and persecuted one another, have blackened Europe with intellectual darkness, deluged it with blood, and have been its chief political nuisances; babbling against civil marriage, against the independence of Church and State, against religious toleration, against education by the State, against the results of modern science; babbling thus while the world, scorning its senile discussions, marches by it and forward to its divinely appointed destinies, and modern opinion surges against the very walls of Rome, and Italy itself would, were the bayonets of France withdrawn, sweep Pope and Council in forty-eight hours from its shores. Most of these theses of the Council—those which most affect American opinions and liberties—have been previously affirmed by the Pope in his Syllabus; they are undeniable ordinances of Popery; the Council will not dare to nullify one of them; and they all strike directly against, not only American opinion, but against the organic law, the very constitution of the Republic. The American prelates in Rome, in voting for them, will become traitors to our most sacred institutions. As State education is among the interdictions of the Syllabus, the American prelates, before they started for Rome, initiated the opposition against our Common School System, as tentative and preparatory for the war they intend to wage when they return, clothed with the authority of the Council and the Pope. And this war, we repeat, is not only against the Common School, but against the whole political system of which the Common School is the

most important support. Foreigners by birth, as most of them are, and monarchists by their Church education, the Catholic ecclesiastics cannot sympathize with American self-government. To them, as to all Roman priests the world over, the Popedom is the supreme state; they owe their first allegiance to that, and they know that the American political system is irreconcilable with it. Their ecclesiastical system cannot effectively stand here while the American system stands, and the American system will stand while the Common School stands. The Common School must, therefore, be swept away. This is the upshot of the whole controversy.

That the Catholic lay citizens of the country generally entertain such views we do not pretend. We all know, however, that most of them have no definite views on any politico-religious matter. They are subject to their priesthood; the latter guide, the former follow their guides. The Common School alone has had any power to correct this abject succumbency; it has been doing so, effectually, with the Catholic youth; the more urgent, therefore, are the ecclesiastics to destroy it. As the chief foundation stone of American democracy, it must be struck away, before political caste and aristocratic and monarchical institutions can be established in the New World—those Old World institutions under which alone Popery can flourish.

To make more sure this policy of the Vatican, a remarkable measure has recently been adopted, contrived, no doubt, by the Jesuits, who really direct its policy. On the 28th of December, 1869, the London "Times" gave the full Latin text of a bull of the Pope dated October 12, which modifies essentially the power of excommunication, by reserving to the Pope himself important cases of excommunication *latæ sententiæ*. A very able American author, Henry Carey Lea, of Philadelphia, has produced some admirably learned and reliable works on Popery, and among them, "Studies in Church History," in which he explains this fearful power of excommunication. After tracing its growth through the corrupt ages of the Church, he says, "The only thing that was lacking to complete the atrocity of the system was found when the canonists devised the plan of making certain offenses punishable with what was known as excommunication *ipso facto*, *ipso jure*, or *latæ sententiæ*. This, as its various names indicate, required neither judge, trial, nor sentence—

the offender was excommunicated by the fact of his offense, and was subjected to all the consequent penalties without warning." This reprobation of the soul applies to the most covert, undetected violation of certain prescriptions of the Pope, among them those of the Syllabus, above noticed. The Pope now reserves to himself the power, hitherto general in the Episcopate, of relieving offenders from some of the perils of the direful proscription. The "New York Evening Post," reviewing the formidable document, says:

Now the bull just issued by the Pope is for the purpose of reserving to himself the right to give absolution in all the important cases of excommunication *latæ sententiæ*. All heretics, and all "those who believe in them, receive them, foster them, or defend them;" all who read their books, retain, print, or defend them; all who refuse to obey the Pope, or appeal from him to a future universal council, or bring ecclesiastics before lay tribunals, or impede their own jurisdiction, or *teach propositions condemned by the Pope*, or "hold communion with persons excommunicated by the Pope, aiding and abetting them," are, *ipso facto*, by the fact of doing so, excommunicated from the Church on earth and in heaven, and consigned to eternal perdition without the need of any trial or sentence by any tribunal whatever; and the Pope reserves to himself the exclusive power to remove the curse from those who may repent of these horrible crimes. It may become important that the people of the United States, and especially those who are Roman Catholics, should understand the attitude which the head of this sect takes toward the institutions of this country. Free speech, free thought, free schools, and the choice of rulers by the people themselves, are all logical opposites of the papal theory and practice; and it is impossible, with consistency, to sustain these, and still to accept as infallible the teachings of the Holy See. Those Roman Catholics who are, by convictions and affection, patriotic citizens of the Republic, are threatened with serious embarrassment by the present attitude of the Pope; and may, ere long, have to choose between their allegiance to him and that they owe to the community in which they live.

The Pope, having by the "Syllabus" condemned State education, toleration, and other fundamental interests of American liberty, now, by the new bull, puts under condemnation, for both worlds, all "who teach propositions condemned by him," and withholds from his bishops, and all other functionaries, the right to pardon and restore offenders thus *ipso facto* excommunicated; he reserves this right to himself, and thereby endangers, for ever, the souls of such offenders, by rendering it

next to impossible for them, especially those as distant as America, to obtain his pardon. Every Catholic in America who sustains our State education becomes, *ipso facto*, excommunicated! The American Bishops are to return from the Council armed with the indorsed "Syllabus" against our Common Schools, and holding up, *in terrorem*, the new bull, with the perdition of excommunication, before the eyes of their people.

With these remarkable facts before us, have we erred in affirming that a great—not merely ecclesiastical, but national—contest impends over us? We must prepare for it. How shall we do so?

First: We must scatter light all through the land on the subject. The people will act rightly, if rightly informed how to act. They will not be willing to surrender so great a public interest as the public education, to ecclesiastical perversion. Our pulpits and public journals should appeal the whole subject to them by incessant discussions.

Second: We should bear in mind that the question is no longer Bible or no Bible in the schools, but Common Schools or no Common Schools. We must not, therefore, waste our energy on the Bible question. The Romanists themselves have relieved us of that. We must save the Common School at whatever sacrifice. We could wish the Bible to be used in the Schools; there is no reason but a petulant sectarian prejudice why it should not be retained as well as any other classic; but rather than allow it to be made a reason, however fallacious, for the overthrow of the School System, we should consent to its reverent withdrawal. The School System, as we plead, is a civil provision, a necessary guarantee of the life of the State. The State, therefore, has a right to maintain it, and to maintain it consistently with its doctrine of impartial religious toleration. Protestants should not be willing to have the religion of their children tampered with in the Common Schools. Most of the teachers of these schools are young men and women, immature and crude in their religious opinions, speculative, and, not a few of them, transcendental. Protestants admit the importance and absolute necessity of religious instruction as a part of education; but they provide it aside from the State school—in their families, their churches, and their Sunday-schools. Let the

Romanists do likewise; but those elements of secular knowledge which are requisite in the education of the national youth, to fit them to be enlightened citizens, and voters, and industrial contributors to the common weal, should be taught by the State. It is her indefeasible right to teach them, as she cannot live with a citizenship uninstructed in them. This is the position for all Protestants to take in the present contest; none other is tenable; this is impregnable.

Third: All Protestants should resolve to decline any further appropriations of public moneys to their respective bodies or institutions. We cannot, ourselves, accept such appropriations without sanctioning a policy which, we clearly see, endows Popery, and endangers the Common School System. We must summarily estop this whole policy. It has been a stratagem of demagogues, chiefly for securing what is called the "foreign vote." That vote has become the most disgraceful feature of American politics. It has corrupted nearly all our municipalities; it is sapping our political morality; it is degrading us before foreign nations; it is oppressing us intolerably by the waste of the public moneys. Out of the $528,000 given to religious denominations by the city of New York the last year, more than $412,000 were given, as we have seen, to Roman Catholics. The donations to the Protestants are but a disguise of the enormous bribes given for the Catholic, the "foreign, vote." Protestantism should no longer consent to be so used and degraded in this political trickery. And there is no self-vindication for it but in an absolute renunciation of the whole policy of sectarian appropriations. It can live and triumph without them; better without than with them. It should not hesitate, then, especially in an exigency like the present.

Lastly: There should be an organized movement in defense of the Common School System. Conventions should be held at convenient points of the Commonwealth; the public journals should be forced by public opinion into the contest; petitions should flow into the Legislature demanding the maintenance of the State education, and the absolute cessation of sectarian appropriations of public money. The clergy have the best opportunity of initiating this movement. They should not hesitate on account of its probable connection with politics. They should be the more prompt, that their influence may be felt before the

subject becomes more immersed in the mire of party politics. The American pulpit was emancipated in the late anti-slavery contest, and it should stand fast in the liberty wherewith Providence has thus made it free. In the Colonial times, and in the struggle for our national independence, it was a power in the land. It abetted, and to no small extent guided, the Revolution that gave us our national existence. It subsequently fell aside from most public, or at least national, questions; and when it began again to speak on them in the abolition agitation, it was denounced by politicians as dabbling in politics, and for a long time was nearly suffocated by public prejudice; it persisted, however, legitimately claiming that *all* questions, *involving Christian ethics*, pertained to its function. It vindicated itself, and triumphed. It saved the Republic in the late war. The Protestant ministry put the national flag upon its spires; it emptied its Sunday-schools of their young men for the army; its appeals aroused the country, and inspired the popular patriotism with irresistible moral force, while the charities of its Churches supplied the unparalleled beneficence of the Sanitary and Christian Commissions. Let it never again forget its relation to the public intelligence and morals. It could now do no better public service than to turn its every altar into a battery for the defense of national education. We are no alarmists; we have not shared, heretofore, in agitations against Popery. Taking those generalized views of its condition and prospects which have been stated in the introduction of this paper, we have seen no great danger from its religious schemes. But now that, commanded by the Vatican, guided by the Syllabus, armed with the new Bull on Excommunication, it is attempting to overthrow a fundamental interest of American liberty and civilization we see looming up one of the most momentous conflicts that has ever menaced the Republic—a conflict between its Protestant civilization and a foreign medieval hierarchy which controls the consciences of nearly one eighth of our population; the long and wearisome struggle between the past and the present which has so much wasted the moral and intellectual life of the Old World, transferred to the New. We fear not the issue, if we only prepare rightly for it. We see in that issue, as we have intimated, more results than the settlement of this one question. But the issue itself depends upon the

popular opinion, and the best, the most effective popular opinion depends upon the free Protestant pulpit of the land.

The country has a right to look to Methodism for pre-eminent service in this struggle. Leaders of other Protestant denominations have not failed to recognize in American Methodism a providential offset to American Romanism. Methodism is present every-where in the land to confront it, and can oppose to it superior forces. The Methodist Episcopal Church embraces but little more than half the aggregate Methodism of the country, but it, alone, reports a clergy numbering (aside from its Local Preachers) more than 8,700, while Popery reports its clerical force (of all sorts) at about 3,500. The Methodist Episcopal Church has 12,000 churches; Popery reports 3,900, and the most liberal calculation for its unreported churches gives it an aggregate of but 4,650. The Methodist Episcopal Church has a membership of 1,114,000; and estimating the non-communicant members of its congregations at three for every communicant, it has a population of 4,456,000; the general population of Popery is comprised in its membership, and cannot much exceed this number.* Add all the other American Methodist bodies to these statistics of the parent Church, (nearly doubling the latter,) and it will be seen that the country has, in Methodism alone, a numerical and moral force sufficient to withstand and overwhelm any opposing force of Popery in a contest which must depend on public opinion and legislation. Let Methodism, then, "move to the front" in this struggle for the national education. Let her speak for it in all her Conferences, pulpits, and journals, and array her whole people for its defense. If she does so, the general Protestantism of the land will follow, and the Papal conspiracy against American education and liberty will be defeated, and, we trust, finally and forever defeated.

* These Papal statistics are made out from Sadlier's Catholic Directory. The denomination does not report (for reasons obvious in the preceding discussion) very fully its statistics, and gives no estimate of its communicants or population. The best American ecclesiastical statistician (Prof. Schem) expresses "the opinion, based upon Reiter's German Catholic Directory, that the Catholic population of the United States numbers less than four millions."

Art. IV.—ON THE POWER OF MIND OVER NATURE.

[ARTICLE SECOND.]

IV. *The power of mind to control the mechanical, chemical, and electrical forces of nature, and make them subservient to intelligent purposes.*

The "*properties*" of matter, density and impenetrability, and the "*affections*" of matter, heat, light, electricity, magnetism, chemical affinity, and motion, may be regarded as natural causes of physical phenomena. The former are passive, (*inertia,*) the latter are active, (*energy.*) "Two classes of causes occur in nature, which, so far as experience goes, never pass one into another. The first class consists of such causes as possess the properties of weight and impenetrability. *These are kinds of matter.* The other class is made up of causes which are wanting in the properties just mentioned, namely, forces, called also imponderables."* "Forces are transformable, indestructible, and (in contradistinction from matter) imponderable objects."† The forces which "affect" matter are the agencies through which mind operates upon matter—a sort of "middle term" between matter and spirit, and as such, largely under the control of the human will. Man, by his intelligence and liberty, can so collocate and adjust these forces as to produce new combinations and new results in the field of nature. He can handle, and decompose, and recompose the substances in nature; and he can set the forces of nature at work on new lines, and under new conditions, so as to produce something which nature alone could never have produced. Man does not, we grant, add new properties to matter, or create new forces; but he places these properties in new conditions, and he disposes these forces in new relations so as to accomplish the ends which he designs.

Consider how man controls and adjusts mechanical powers. We may take a time-piece as an illustration. The elasticity of steel, the power of the lever, the equal vibrations of the pendulum, are properties of matter. These properties would never have originated uniform motion, marking the flow of

* *Mayer*, in "Correlation and Consecration of Forces," p. 252. † Ibid., p. 345.

time without particular collocation and special adjustment. When this is intelligently done uniform motion is the result. Man does not create these mechanical powers, but he lays hold upon them, he controls and directs them, and he sets them upon a course which he designs. "He did not give elasticity to the steel, but he relates it to the other parts of the mechanism so as to give an impulse to the whole. He did not ordain the equal vibrations of the pendulum, but he placed it in that position where it restrains the movements of the wheels, and gives the machine a regular and uniform movement so as to divide time;" and in doing so he produces something above nature.

In the conversion of water into steam a certain mechanical force is developed. The amount of this force depends, however, on the resistance which is presented to the vapor. The expansibility of water, the power of heat to generate steam, the power of cohesion and resistance in iron, are all properties of matter. But these alone are not sufficient to develop a force which shall propel a vessel against wind and tide, and drive the railroad train on an horizontal or a slightly inclined plane. It is by a collocation of these forces that the steam-engine utilizes power. The force which is generated by the conversion of a liquid into vapor, and the power of resistance in the cylinder and piston, are so adjusted to each other as to secure motion, and this power is connected with the "point of application" by a succession of levers which secures a series of increased velocities. The mere properties or forces of matter would never have produced these orderly and beneficial results were it not for an interposing intelligence ordaining conditions and relations in which they may operate in an orderly and beneficial manner. Nature, as Dr. Bushnell justly remarks, never built a ship, or a steam-engine, or a railroad carriage, or a printing press; all of which having been done by man, is something above nature. These, and similar events, all spring out of human liberty acting in and upon the realm of cause and effect, and producing effects which merely natural causation could not produce.

The power of man to control the chemical forces in nature is well exhibited in the manufacture and use of gunpowder, by which he tears rocks asunder and hurls projectiles through the

air. The desideratum in the manufacture of gunpowder is to generate a large quantity of gaseous matter at a high temperature. This is secured by combining six parts of nitrate of potash with one part each of sulphur and charcoal. When fired, the niter, by its decomposition, furnishes oxygen, which combines with the carbon, forming carbonic acid; the sulphur at the same time combines with the potash, thus generating nitrogen and carbonic acid gases; and these, at the moment of explosion, occupy more than a thousand times the volume of the powder from which it is formed. Here again is an instance of the power of man to set in order a train of causes, existing elementally in nature, which has produced the most extraordinary results. The discovery of gunpowder has exerted a mighty influence on the history of civilization. It has mitigated the barbarities, and diminished the fatality, of warfare. It has extended the geographical area of educated nations, and it has, in reality, been eminently serviceable to the interests of peace.*

The freezing of water inside red hot crucibles is another striking example of the power of intelligent man so to adjust and collocate natural laws as to produce results which nature alone could never have produced. The "spheroidal condition" of liquids in contact with heated surfaces, upon which the success of the experiment depends, is, of course, a natural law. But the placing of sulphurous acid in the red hot crucible, (which, in reality, does not come in contact with the hot crucible, in consequence of its having assumed the spheroidal state, and thus being surrounded by a cushion of elastic vapor,) and the placing of water on the sulphurous acid, which is instantly converted into ice, is the act of man. Man's increasing knowledge of the laws of nature has been constantly accompanied by advancing power over nature; and the author of "The Reign of Law" anticipates the final and complete subjugation of all nature to the intelligence of man.

Every student of chemistry is aware that man has been able to produce *new substances*—substances not found in nature—which are of the utmost value in manufactures, medicine, and the arts. He does not need to be informed that iodide of potash, iodide of mercury, nitrate of silver, and numberless

* See Buckle's "History of Civilization," pp. 146–150, vol. i.

other substances, are not found in nature; that nitric acid, bichromate of potash, alcohol, so extensively used in manufactures, are not natural products; and that chromate of lead, (yellow,) oxide of lead, (red,) arsenite of copper, (Paris green,) and the aniline colors, (the finest purples and violets,) are all creations of chemical skill.

It is scarce necessary to direct attention to the control which man exerts over the electrical and magnetic forces. The achievements of the Electro-Magnetic Telegraph are known to all our readers. The Atlantic cable needs only to be supplemented by a Pacific cable, and man may bid the subtle, and invisible, and immaterial power to convey his messages to the ends of the earth, and around the world.

V. *The influence which man, by his intelligence, exerts over the vegetable life of the globe.*

Remarkable changes, and astonishing modifications in the development of vegetable life, have been effected by man. He has transferred plants from their original habitat, placed them in new conditions of light, temperature, and soil, and they have undergone changes in consequence so great as scarcely to be recognized as the same species. One of the most obvious changes resulting from the agency of man is an increase in the *size* of the cultivated plant. This change is strikingly exhibited in the parsnip and the carrot. The woody, spindly root of the *Daucus carota* has been transformed into the large, juicy, Arlington carrot. Not only has the size of the entire organism been changed, but the relative development of the individual parts of the plant has been greatly modified by the agency of man. Thus cultivation converts a single into a double flower, as in the rose and the dahlia. In fact every natural flower is single, and wherever we have a double flower it is the result of cultivation. Cultivation also obliterates spines, and prickles, and thorns, a change which Linnæus designates "the taming of wild plants," and of which we have examples in the apple and the plum. A great number of plants which, in their natural state, were creepers, and trailed upon the ground, when cultivated have reared their stalks and stand erect; while others that were annuals become perennial, and biennials have become annuals.

Remarkable changes have also been effected in the *color* of flowers by the agency of man. Placing charcoal around the roots has darkened and enriched the colors of the dahlia, the rose, and the petunia. Carbonate of soda reddens the ornamental hyacinth; and super-phosphate of soda alters, in various ways, the hue and bloom of other cultivated plants. The *Hydrangea Hortensis* has been changed from red to blue; and Mr. Herbert asserts that from a red cowslip he has raised a primrose, an oxlip, a polyanthus, and a hose-in-hose cowslip. The statement of Mr. Herbert has been confirmed by the experiments of Prof. Henslow, of Cambridge.*

Fruits have also been astonishingly developed, and modified in color and in flavor, by the action of man. The crab has been transformed into an apple, and varieties have been multiplied without limit. In 1850 more than fifteen hundred varieties had been enumerated. The sloe has been converted into the plum; the *Pulsica Vulgaris*, a native of Persia, into the peach, of which we have now two hundred varieties. And such a command over nature has man acquired in this department, that it is claimed "he can command any *flavor* of the fruit he may desire."†

Perhaps one of the most wonderful transformations is that of *Brassica Oleracea*. Its native habitat is the sea-coast, where it is a bitter, acrid plant. Man has transferred it to a more wholesome soil, and it has lost its saltness, and been metamorphosed into three vegetables as distinct from each other as they are unlike the parent plant—the cabbage, the cauliflower, and the broccoli. Our gardens, in fact, are full of such vegetable transformations; not so marked and striking, perhaps, as the *Brassica Oleracea*, but still such as to impress us with a sense of the amazing power which man wields in the direction and government of natural laws. Our cultivated potatoes, in all their variety of color, size, and flavor, have been produced by man from a tiny, bitter root, which has its native home on the sea-coast in Chili.

These instances may be taken as illustrations of the power of man to modify, and indeed materially alter, the vegetable life on the globe. In this department he has produced results

* See Lyell's "Principles of Geology," p. 590.

† "Cottage Gardener."

which nature alone could never have produced. Nature alone never produced a double rose, or a Rhode Island Greening, or a Lawton Blackberry, or a Cuyahoga Grape. These are results of man's action upon nature. They show that nature is flexible to the hand of intelligent man.

VI. *The influence of man on the physical development, habits, and instinct of animals.*

The power of man to control, modify, and subordinate nature, has been strikingly exhibited in this department. In animal organisms, as well as vegetable, there is a remarkable susceptibility to the external conditions of climate, food, domestication, and the like, so as to present a remarkable deviation from general uniformity. Peculiarities sometimes arise, to all appearances *de novo*, originating in causes which are scarcely appreciable. Many of these deviations and peculiarities are rendered perpetual by hereditary transmission.

Selecting those animals which have the most flexible frame and constitution, and which even Professor Owen regards as "having been predestinated and prepared for man," he has for ages been conducting experiments in varying their forms, modes of life, and instincts, so as to make them more fully subservient to his use and pleasure. And the amount of his success has been amazing. Animals have been altered in size and materially changed in form, as may be seen by comparing the Shetland pony with the Arabian race-horse, which have unquestionably a common origin; and the Italian grayhound with the Newfoundland dog, which are undoubtedly of one species. Instincts have been obliterated, or rendered dormant, as in the horse; and new instincts or habits have been induced and become hereditary, as in the Pointer and Retriever dogs.

Dogs are all, unquestionably, of one species, and have therefore had one common origin. This is asserted by every naturalist of note, from Baron Cuvier to Professor Owen. The number and relation of the bones are the same in all the varieties of dogs; the form of the teeth is the same, the period of gestation is the same, and when they have run wild, as in Cuba and South America, the varieties have disappeared, and they have returned to the common form. Now let any dog-fancier pass before his mind all the varieties with which he is

acquainted, and he will see how man has strangely and marvelously modified nature by his knowledge and control of nature's laws. For in nature we shall seek in vain for the Scotch Terrier, the Shepherd's dog, the Italian Grayhound, the Newfoundland dog, the Pointer, the Retriever, and others which might be named. These forms and characteristics belong to the sphere of domestication and civilization. They have been superinduced on the flexible nature of the species by the genius of man.

The habits of the dog have been altered in a noteworthy manner by his association with man. In a wild state the dog is gregarious, hunting in packs of fifty or more. In the domestic state he takes on him the peculiar individuality of his master, prefers his society, and drives other dogs from the premises. The wild dogs of South America, and the Gingo of Australia, do not bark. Barking is an acquired, hereditary instinct, and probably originated in the attempt to imitate the human voice. Peculiar faculties also are developed in the domestic dog which are not displayed in a state of simple nature. Some, as the Shepherd's dog, will drive home a flock of sheep; he will take all precaution to prevent their scattering, and readily bring back the wanderers; he will even keep two flocks from mingling, and if mixed, will separate them. The Setting dog will find and start the game; the Pointer will stop and indicate the position of the game, and the Retriever will gather it up and bear it to his master. These qualities, which at first are the result of education, soon become hereditary, so that the young dog, on being taken for the first time into the field, will behave as well as its parent.

The same remarks are equally applicable to the various breeds of horses, oxen, and sheep. All horses are of one species, yet how do they differ in size, build, temper, and physiognomy, from the Shetland pony to the Arabian racer. "Of all the quadruped servants of man, none has proved of more value to him, in peace or in war, than the horse: none have co-operated with the advancing races more influentially in man's destined mastery over the earth and its lower denizens. In all the modifications of the old palæotherian type to the end, the horse has acquired nobler proportions and higher faculties; more strength, more speed, with amenability to the bit. As such, I

believe the horse to have been predestinated and prepared for man." *

Darwin, in his work "On the Origin of Species," has given some striking illustrations of the modification of nature in the varieties of pigeons. History shows that the breeding of pigeons occupied the attention of naturalists two thousand years ago, and was an amusement even for kings; so that now we have remarkable and extensive varieties, as the Tumbler, the Carrier, the Trumpeter, the Fantail, the Turbot, the Barb, the Jacobin, etc. These are all one species, and have descended from the *Columbia Livia*, or Rock Pigeon. The changes which have been effected both in the form and habits of this bird are remarkable. The short-faced Tumbler has a beak in outline almost like that of a Finch. The Tumbler has a singular habit of flying in compact flocks, and tumbling heels over head. The Runt is a bird of great size, with long, massive beak and large feet. The Pouter has an enormously developed crop, which it glories in inflating. The Turbit has a line of reversed feathers down the breast; the Jacobin has its feathers so much reversed along the back of the neck as to form a hood. The Trumpeter utters a different *coo*. The Fantail has thirty or forty tail-feathers, instead of twelve or fourteen, and they are expanded and carried erect, so that in good birds the head and tail touch. The Carrier will find his way home from Brussels to London. The means by which these changes are effected are now so well understood, that Sir John Sibright affirms "he could produce any given feather in three years, and any head and beak in six."

A curious instance of the pliability of an animal organism is seen in the changes which have been wrought on the Golden Carp. Not only has an infinite variety of spotted, striped, variegated colors been produced in these fishes, but, especially among the Chinese, all sorts of changes have been brought about in this single species. Some are rendered short and stout, others long and slender; some with ventral side swollen, others hunchbacked; some with the mouth greatly enlarged, while in others the caudal fin, which in the normal condition of the species is placed vertically at the end of the tail, has become crested and arched, or is doubled or crooked, or has

* Professor Owen on Life and Species, in the American Journal, Jan., 1869, p. 43.

swerved in some other way from its original pattern. All these are striking variations in a family of fishes which, in their wild state, are very monotonous in their appearance all the world over.

Darwin adduces many of these instances of *variation* in support of his doctrine of "natural selection." He thinks that the origin and diversity of species may be accounted for by the natural action of the conditions under which they exist. Because the intelligence of man has been able to produce certain varieties in domesticated animals, therefore physical causes have produced all the diversity existing among wild ones. This conclusion, as Agassiz has shown, does not follow logically from the premises. "Domesticated varieties do not explain the origin of species, except, as I have said, by showing *that the intelligent will of man can produce effects which physical causes have never been known to produce*, and that we must, therefore, look to some cause outside of nature, corresponding in kind to the intelligence of man, though so different in degree, for all the phenomena connected with the existence of animals in their wild state.

"So far from attributing these original differences among animals to natural influences, it would seem that, while a certain freedom of development is left, within the limits of which man can exercise his intelligence and ingenuity, not even this superficial influence is allowed to physical conditions unaided by some guiding power, since, in their normal state, the wild species remain, so far as we have been able to discover, entirely *unchanged;* maintained, it is true, in their integrity by the circumstances established for their support, but never altered by them. Nature holds inviolable the stamp that God has set upon his creatures; and if man is able to influence their organization in some slight degree, it is because God has given to his relations with the animals he has intended for his companions the same plasticity which he has allowed to every other side of his life, in virtue of which he may in some sort mold and shape it to his own ends, and be held responsible also for its results."*

These facts and principles may serve to indicate for us *man's place in nature.*

He is not a mere thing of nature, bound down and imprisoned

* Agassiz's "Method of Study in Natural History," pp. 146, 147.

by the necessary laws of cause and effect, but a being above nature, who can subjugate nature by his intelligence and liberty. "Using nature as his organ, the Deity transcends it: the act in which he does so is the exercise of his free volition, rendering determinate what was indeterminate before: it is thus the characteristic of such act to be *supernatural;* and man, so far as he shares a like prerogative, occupies a like position, standing to that extent outside and above the realm of natural law, and endowing with existence either side of an alternative possibility." * Revelation teaches that man is invested with dominion over the material and sentient creation; he is

Creation's heir, creation's lord.

"Thou hast made him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet. All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea." Psalm viii. The world was therefore made for man; made to be the theater of his activity, the school for his education, the gymnasium for his moral development and spiritual perfection. This is also the doctrine of science. Geology teaches that through countless ages God has, by the slow operation of natural law, been preparing the earth as a suitable residence for man. The mineral treasures of the earth have been laid up for his use; its rocks and soils have been prepared for him; the plants and animals are subject to him, many of them exhibiting a readiness and aptitude for domestication, and a flexibility of nature to be shaped and molded by the hand of man. "Man," says Agassiz, "is the end toward which all geological changes have looked, the end toward which all the animal creation has tended, from the first appearance of the vertebrated type." And nature is also the field for the exercise and development of the free powers of man. The mind of man has a creative *force* and *energy*. It has also within it the ideas of *utility*, of *beauty*, and of *perfection*, which are ceaselessly tending toward actualization. The material universe is the field in which these powers of man are to find their fullest exercise. Man is not the slave of nature, the mere sport of external conditions, but the master of nature's processes, the interpreter of nature's laws, and thus able to guide unintelligent

* Martineau, "Essays," p. 126.

nature-forces toward rational and beneficent ends. "Human freedom," even the skeptical Strauss admits, "controls natural development."* Hence it is that man, as distinguished from the brute, is a *progressive* being, and tends toward a higher perfection.

Guided by the facts and principles above developed, we may readily detect the fallacy of that philosophy which insists with so much vehemence on the absolute "uniformity of nature" as a chain of universal causation, embracing all being and excluding all *providential* interposition.

The system of the universe is one in which we have *general* laws securing *uniformity*, and in which we have also *particular dispositions and collocations of physical forces resulting in complications and fortuities.* There are not only necessary events but contingent events. There is not only that which is designed, but that which is fortuitous and accidental. There is not only uniform sequence, but there is also chance. There are not only inanimate things subject to unvarying law, but there are free beings having an alternative power of choice.

Nature, therefore, is not sternly rigid, but *flexible;* pliable to the hand of man, and especially to the hand of God. If man has molded nature and controlled it, so that destructive agents, as fire and electricity, have been converted into beneficial agents, and poisonous agents have been rendered remedial agents, much more may God control nature-forces, of which he is the author, and constrain them to fulfill specific ends, beneficial results, which nature in her uniform movement would not have produced. If nature is controlled by finite mind it certainly may be controlled by the Infinite Mind. Amid the fortuities and contingencies which arise in the crossing and conflicts of opposite forces in nature, and especially those which arise in the exercise of the power of alternative choice which is exercised by free beings, there is abundant room for prudence, skill, and foresight on the part of man, and special providence on the part of God.

For what is providence but prevision, foresight, forethought, and wise provision for all contingencies. It supposes a preconcerted plan, a constant supervision of the working out of that plan, and the direction, management, and subordination

* Vol. i, p. 72.

of all agencies toward the completion of that plan. It is of little consequence to our argument whether all the contingencies which may arise in the conflict of nature-forces, and of human passions and interests, were foreseen and provided for before "the foundation of the world," or whether they are specially provided for in the time-march of nature and history; in either case it is *providence*, that is, the action of an intelligent will on nature and humanity. In neither case is the divine wisdom "taken by surprise," nor is there any "amendment" or "patching up" of natural law to meet an unlooked-for emergency, as some have foolishly insinuated. When man, in the exercise of his prudent forethought, provides against future contingencies—when he erects his metallic rod to guide the fiery lightning harmless to the earth, and thus protects his earthly dwelling-place—when he builds his fire-proof safe to resist the ravages of fire—when he shields his fruit trees against the blasting power of frost—when he tears the rocks in sunder by the force of explosive chemical agents—when he lays up a store of provision against a season of dormancy or drought—he does not violate the laws of nature, but subordinates and utilizes them, and compels them to subserve higher and nobler ends. And so the "special providence" of God works in harmony with natural laws which are the ordinances of his general government. "The universe is the manifestation and abode of a Free Mind like our own; embodying his personal thoughts in its adjustments, realizing his own ideas in its phenomena, just as we express our inner faculty and character through the natural language of our external life. . . . The grandest natural agents are thus but the servitors of a grander than themselves; the winds are his messengers, and flaming fire his minister. Using nature as his organ, he transcends it; the act in which he does so is the exercise of his own free volition, rendering determinate what was indeterminate before; it is then the character of such act to be *supernatural*." Instead, therefore, of confining the "supernatural" within the "bounds of natural law," and thus making the term itself a misnomer and a contradiction, and subjecting the divine will itself to natural law, as the Duke of Argyll has done, we must say with Martineau, that "*all that is natural lies within the supernatural*." We can have no sympathy with the science or the

theology which deprives the Deity of his absolute freedom, and makes of him something less than an *ever-living Will.* On the one hand we must repudiate the science (falsely so called) which makes creation a 'necessary evolution' of matter and force, even if that force be dignified by the name 'God.' And on the other hand we must reject that theology which limits the divine will to the single act of a sudden miracle of creation 'in the beginning,' and leaves the universe to the predestinated roll of an unchangeable and inflexible mechanism. A living will must ever be a living will, and must have a ceaseless exercise. God must for ever be the Lord. The universe must still be under his control. The limited freedom which is permitted to man, and by which he produces new results, and adapts his action to new conditions, must for ever be to us an intimation and an illustration of the exercise of the unlimited power by which the Deity "worketh his own will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth."

In the light of the facts and principles above presented all the objections to a *supernatural religion* seem to us to vanish in thin air.

Among most scientific men the prevalent conception of the "miraculous" is that of power acting independent of all means, and in conflict with all natural laws; whereas the true conception is that of *a power exercised through the use of means which are beyond our knowledge and control*, and which exercises of power belong to a realm of moral order which is above the order of nature.

It is not incumbent upon us that we shall regard a miracle "as an event opposed to and in conflict with natural law." Such a definition exposes the defense of Christianity to insurmountable difficulties. Christian theology does not require that we shall regard a miracle in any other light than the intervention of a Being of *superhuman* power, modifying, controlling, collocating, and adjusting the operation of natural laws to secure higher purposes, and to accomplish ends which are not secured by the uniform action of mere nature alone. "The miracles of revelation, with all the objective supernaturalness essentially belonging to them, are in truth somewhat accordant with natural laws, partly in reference to the higher order of circumstances to which the miracles relate, *and which order is also a*

world, a nature of its own kind, and operates upon the lower order of things according to its mode; partly in regard to the *analogy with that common nature*, which miracles in some way or other retain, and finally on account of their teleological perfection."*

Man, in the exercise of his intelligence and freedom, is perpetually interfering with, modifying, controlling, and collocating natural laws. He does so if he but disturb one pebble in a state of rest, or stay the fall of another before it reach the ground. He does so on a larger scale when he lifted the dome of St. Peter on its arches, and thus resists the law of gravitation, or projects a cannon ball to the distance of miles, or tears the rocks asunder, or freezes water in red-hot crucibles, or constrains the winds, or steam, or light, or electricity, or chloroform to accomplish his intelligent purposes and fulfill his will.

Man's acting upon nature proves that there is in him a power *above* nature. The results of many of his actions may be properly and strictly pronounced "supernatural." God's action upon nature may be conceived as analogous to man's action upon nature. The difference between finite power and infinite power constitutes a *miracle*, that is, it is not only supernatural, but *superhuman*.

To our mind, therefore, it is just as easy to believe in a "miracle," say the turning of water into wine, as to believe that water can be frozen in a red-hot crucible, or the thoughts and words of man transmitted on insulated wires over thousands of miles in a few seconds. Finite power achieves the one, infinite power achieves the other.

* Nitzsch's System of Christian Doctrine, page 84.

Art. V.—MINISTERIAL TRANSFERS.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years 1868–9.

"The Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church" open to our view a most remarkable record. As a chronicle of our itinerant work, they show how a small band of men, beginning a century ago in a chamber in the city of New York, have spread out the net-work of circuits and stations across the entire continent. More than a million of members are embraced in the expanding fold. The small corps of preachers has grown to an army of more than eight thousand. Nor does the first impulse given to the work appear to have spent its force; the revival progresses, and affords promise of continuing, if not with unabated strength, yet with remarkable vigor, for another century.

The circuits of some of the first itinerants were as large as the kingdom of Great Britain. They often spread over whole States. In our day, annual conferences have been carved out of primitive circuits. The ministry were, emphatically, a circulating medium. Broad as were the fields, those men, inspired with an irrepressible zeal for God and for the spread of scriptural holiness, swept like a flame through the continent. In all the land Methodism breathed the same spirit, uttered the same sentiment, and displayed a power which no obstacles could successfully oppose.

But, as the work became developed and churches multiplied on the territory, the magnificent field was unfortunately *fenced off into conferences;* and the preachers, by this process, became restricted to narrower limits, till at length annual conferences are often smaller, territorially, than the circuits of the fathers. Still more unfortunately, as this restricting process advanced, the difficulty of transcending conference boundaries also increased. With the fathers, conference boundaries were mere imaginary lines, drawn for ecclesiastical convenience, but liable to be passed without challenge; while in our day they have grown into hirsute iron fences, so high that no one can venture to scale them without exposing himself to the danger of being impaled.

In the early days, in the absence of railroads and steamboats, and even of good carriage-roads, when the itinerant must proceed on horseback, there was some excuse for restricting and narrowing the fields of travel; but in our more favored time, when the passage from Boston to Chicago is easier than it then was from New York to Albany, we have every inducement to diffuse our ministerial gifts—to break out of the old grooves, to seek new channels, to become free of the continent. But, somewhat strangely, as facilities for inter-communication have improved, our ecclesiastical lines have become more closely drawn, insomuch that with us the interchange of ministerial talent with distant fields is less frequent than in other denominations. In the Congregational, Baptist, and Episcopal Churches, ministers pass frequently and freely from east to west, and from west to east, while with us the transfers are the exceptions, are effected with difficulty, and are regarded as objectionable, and to be rendered as infrequent as possible. The conferences have come to be a series of ecclesiastical pens, where the members are kept close; and if any chance to escape, he is pursued as a stray till he can be inclosed and held till property is proved and costs paid. Instead of being the most itinerant, we have, perhaps, become the most localized of American Churches.

This departure from the early usage of the denomination is to be deprecated. The primitive efficiency and power of the body is attributable, in no small measure, to the frequent and wide interchange of ministerial talent. The fire of the South, and the reckless daring of the West, gave intensity to the more staid society of the East; while the intellect and disciplined zeal of the East lent strength and steadiness to the remoter and newer sections of the country. That equal advantages, at the present time, would inure to all parts of the work by a similar practice, cannot be doubted. Different sections of the country are complemental of each other, and if we would have a harmonious country or a symmetrical Church, each must feel the influence of the other. The ministry, as the sympathetic band uniting the Churches, should be somewhat more general, more diffusive, touching more distant points in the field of labor. By such a diffusion of the talents of the ministry, it cannot be doubted that great advantages to both preachers and people

would be realized. Only a few of them in passing can be enumerated.

1. Transfers would facilitate the arrangement of the appointments. The appointments are the hinges on which the itinerancy turns, and whatever can aid in adjusting them will tend to remove friction from the machinery, and to render the system successful. The ground of the appointment is *fitness;* the gifts selected to fill the pulpit are to be adapted to the wants of the people. That the arrangement is arbitrary, is altogether a mistaken view of the case, and one sure to prove fatal in practice. The wise and successful administrator endeavors, in each case, to ascertain the application of this law of fitness, and, of course, the wider the field from which he may draw, the more likely is he to secure a suitable appointment. Confined to a single presiding elder's district, however clearly he may discern the demands of the work, he will find it in many cases impossible to secure a happy adjustment; but allow him a wider scope, through an entire conference or a dozen conferences, and he will, by this law of affinity, approximate an harmonious adjustment of all the gifts. The brilliant talents, however obscured, will gravitate, as by some unknown law, to the dominant charge; while the brother who has failed in one section, transferred to a more genial clime, to a more fertile soil, affording him a new probation, under favorable conditions, will earn a higher name for himself and the Church.

2. More extended transfers would tend to maintain the unity of Methodism over the entire Republic. In the primitive Church, the spiritual union of the faithful was regarded as an infallible sign of discipleship, as well as the most potent argument with which to convince the unbelieving of the truth and excellency of the Gospel. By this weapon the foe was repelled, while the body of believers, as in solid phalanx, pressed to the conquest of the world. What men had denied to power, to intelligence, to moral beauty, they yielded to love and fraternal unity. The world rushed to the embrace of a united Church. In this respect Methodism was a copy of the apostolic Church. It was a gospel of love—a system in which the hearts of the disciples were closely cemented in a common experience and a common mission. The whole Church gathered by an itinerant ministry in troublous times, "was of one mind."

In this fundamental condition time has wrought a change. Divisive agencies are now in operation. Scattered over an extended continent, with a local ministry and local interests, the tendency of our Churches is to diversity, to separation. Unconsciously, it may be, but fatally, we are growing apart. Each conference is assuming a type of its own—of thought, of style, of worship; the centrifugal is overmastering the centripetal force, insomuch that our people are being molded more by local influences than by the central ideas and forces of the denomination. That the change is silent, and almost imperceptible, does not disprove its existence and operation; all the dominant forces of nature operate in silence. But what is wrought out in the silent laboratory of history will, in due time, become manifest on the stage of events, in fierce contests and revolutions which may rend the Church in fragments.

To arrest this localizing and separating tendency in the Church no agency may be entirely adequate; and yet it cannot be doubted that a wider distribution of our ministry would exert a most beneficial influence in that direction. Many of our disaffections, of our secessions, arise from local causes, which would be modified, if not arrested, in their operation by the introduction of new ministerial talent into the field. The Church, in 1844, was cleft asunder because different ideas and styles of thought dominated in the two sections. If the preachers had been freely and largely interchanged, transferring those from the North into the South, and *vice versa*, who believes the catastrophe of that year could have occurred? The intermingling of men would have moderated and given juster views to all sides, and would have delayed, if not entirely prevented, the terrible struggle through which we as a nation have passed.

In the future progress of the Church new questions await us which will agitate deeply and threaten the unity of the body. To forestall, and, so far as possible, prevent, such a result, every precaution should be taken. Local efforts should be overshadowed by the grand enterprises of the Church at large, and the preachers, by circulating through the organization, should be deprived of the power to perpetrate local evil. In accordance with the spirit of our economy they should be ministers of the whole Church, not of a section, and should be enlisted

to promote the causes approved by the denomination, rather than those of a locality.

3. The proper development of the magnificent field assigned us by Providence requires a wide distribution, a frequent interchange of ministerial talent. The field is large, extending from ocean to ocean, and from the frozen North to the tepid waters of the Gulf, as well as to the nations beyond, and affords such a variety of condition, of culture, of nationality, as to demand very diverse gifts for its proper culture and development. In the center, the unoccupied part of the continent, the incoming tide of immigrants calls for a corps of enterprising preachers capable of toil, of exposure, in following close upon the pioneer; in the South, a field blasted and blackened by the war storm, and presenting to us a heterogeneous people struggling amid conflicting passions to rise to a better condition, a band of wise and courageous men is required; while, in the older and more staid East, enjoying a measure of accumulated wealth, a higher culture, are calls for more able pulpit men. In each of these sections again are met other varieties of people, of ideas, of tastes, of usages to meet which requires specific gifts and powers; here a builder, there a preacher, a controversialist, a revivalist, an educator, or a peacemaker, as the case may be.

With talent adequate to meet all demands, it often happens that that talent is unequally distributed. The comparatively sterile field may have been blessed with a large number of laborers, while the rich and promising one, opening in another direction, suffers for want of them. In this way the whole work, in consequence of the improper arrangement of our men, is damaged. To remedy the evil, we do not so much require new talent, as the re-adjustment of what we already possess. Detail from the more favored sections a body of earnest workers, of born reapers, to the destitute fields, and they will, doubtless, come again with rejoicing, bringing their sheaves with them. The good blood should not all be allowed to flush a single part of the body ecclesiastic, thus engendering fever and feebleness; a portion of it drawn to remote sections will reduce the inflammation, and, by quickening the general circulation, will promote the health and vigor of the entire system.

The free circulation of our ministerial talent above recom-

mended, it has been supposed by some, would militate against the less favored sections; a conclusion evidently wide of the truth, as this plan, by cutting the ministry loose from special centers, and placing them in a position to be sent to serve the localities in most need, would afford them a far better chance to live than they now enjoy. The first step toward securing ministerial talent is to dislodge it from its old positions. Thus much is done by our plan, as well as to direct it in the way to the open fields. Moreover, men would cheerfully serve less desirable sections for a period if they knew beforehand that they were not to be permanently attached to them, or that their standing in the Church was not to be affected by such service. Localities which *taboo* men are disliked. No one would care to be pinned down, like a serf of the soil, at Spitzbergen; but once free to roam the continent or the world, he would find it quite agreeable to make a voyage northward, and to spend some portion of the hot season in the colder latitudes. Many preachers would not only consent, but would find it profitable to spend a time in other conferences, provided they could do so without being disinherited by the family in which they were born, and having their funeral sermons preached before they were under the turf; or if they could return again without confessing their errors and running the gauntlet of a fierce opposition.

4. But this circulatory system would prove no less favorable to the development of the men than of the work. Individuals who spend life about the homestead ordinarily, like grass in old fields, remain narrow and only partially developed; while those emigrating to new sections imbibe a fresh inspiration, and take on a higher vigor. The change, the transference to a new soil, to another climate, proves a most valuable school. Travel is an essential part of the best education. With books and schools a man may remain shriveled and contracted in his views, and be quite unable to deliver a sound judgment on broad questions; while a wider view, a freer circulation through the great world, would broaden and develop him, and make of him quite another and higher man. Valuable as our early surroundings may be, the accomplished man must pass beyond them, must thrust out his roots into other soils, must feel the breath of other climates, the touch of other peoples, of other

customs; must cross other channels of thought, of experience, of enterprise, in order to supply his own deficiencies. In a word, if he would be a full man, a trained man; if he would possess a rounded, symmetrical life, he must secure the advantages of travel. Pent up in his narrow inclosure, he necessarily remains ignorant of much and of all those kinds of knowledge which come to us only at first hand. The gorgeous city can never be known by a few sample bricks, nor this magnificent world appreciated through other men's eyes and ears.

In this respect Methodist preachers enjoy eminent advantages. While others pass transiently over sections of the country, obtaining a bird's-eye view of the surroundings, sipping a little from the great store, they are allowed by our system to spend two or three years in a place, the more carefully to study all objects of interest. It may be well to have a home in a particular conference; but why should not a Methodist preacher, from this center, pass out into the regions beyond, into the Middle States, into the Mississippi Valley, across the Rocky Mountains, upon the Pacific coast, around by the Sandwich Islands and Mexico—no matter how far provided only he come around in time to die? Such a peregrination, extending through several years, touching a variety of the sources of knowledge, would prove an education superior to that of any university. It would bring him in contact with men and things; it would stimulate him to better endeavors; it would build him out on all sides.

While transfers would prove a means of education, they would at the same time afford new opportunities and incitements for men to rise. The prophet would pass out from home, where he could not do many mighty works, since the people did not believe. They knew him as a child, as a beginner, in his attempts, his failures, in that small charge, and can never learn to think of him as capable of sustaining any higher relations. Restrained and repressed, he may yet possess all the elements of the higher success which, transferred to a new district or conference, to more favorable conditions, affording a fairer probation, would carry him above many of those hitherto deemed his superiors.

5. Such an arrangement would prove a not inconsiderable advantage by allowing us to confine our conferences to still narrower limits. If the members of a conference are to remain

permanently within its bounds, it should be large, in order to afford an ample field for the circulation of the men, however inconvenient it might be to entertain such a body in its annual gatherings; but, on the other hand, if men are allowed to slide over those bounds freely, it does not matter so much where the lines are traced.

The only serious objection to this course seems to be the damage which might ensue to the conference *animus*, the *esprit de corps*. This objection is capable of a twofold answer. The conference spirit might be merged in the more catholic Church spirit, or in case this sympathy between smaller bodies of men be deemed essential, so large a part of the members would remain for a long period as would be able to maintain it. If the plan were carried out, a majority would probably remain, and even many of the new men would continue so long that they would imbibe the spirit of the body and essentially aid in maintaining its *status*.

But, admitting the advantages of a wider circulation of our preachers, the question recurs, How shall the localizing evil be corrected? "The preachers are opposed to transfers, and in favor of maintaining the conferences as a sort of close corporations." They are opposed to irregular transfers—to bargains between particular men and Churches—to such arrangements as give one party an advantage over another; but they are not understood to object to exchanges where the advantages will prove to be mutual.

With the war against unjust and irregular transfers, some plan is needed by which they can be affected with greater facility. The preachers should pass from one conference to another as easily as now from one district to another. New men should come full-fledged, eligible to all positions in the body.

Is such a plan feasible? With Congregationalism there might be a difficulty; but, happily, our economy affords the means of compassing the end. It was constructed for this very purpose, and, if faithfully worked, will distribute to appropriate fields the talent of the body. Bishops and presiding elders may work beyond as well as within particular conference lines. The outline of our plan for this would be, briefly, something like the following:

1. Divide the Church into a number of large districts, each embracing several annual conferences. For instance, one of them might include all of New England, or this with a part of New York added. These districts might equal the number of the Bishops, each of whom should have the general supervision of one for the year or for four years.

2. Let this larger district, so far as appointments are concerned, be common territory to all the preachers embraced in it. Whatever conference a preacher may join, he may be transferred as freely to others as from one presiding elder's district to another.

3. In order to arrange these inter-conference exchanges, let there be a meeting of all the presiding elders of the different conferences embraced in this episcopal district, over whose deliberations the Bishop may preside.

This plan would afford all the advantages of large conferences, and would avoid the disadvantages. It would prevent any sensitiveness about conference lines. While it would enable us to reduce the conferences to smaller dimensions, a broad field would still be open, inviting the talent of the denomination. With these appliances the Bishops would be able to transfer men much more freely than at present through the entire connection, and our ministry would become itinerant in this larger sense.

Art. VI.—DID THE "CHURCH SOUTH" SECEDE?

The response of the Southern Bishops at St. Louis in May last to the advances of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church toward a reunion of the two Churches resented as an indignity the incidental placing of the withdrawal of the Wesleyans and the Southerners on a level, from the fact that the former was a secession, while the latter was accordant with a plan of separation agreed upon by the General Conference. "We separated from you," they say, "in no sense in which you did not separate from us. The separation was by compact, and mutual." They also say that, "Only on this basis"

is there any hope of nearer approaches to each other. Reunion must be preceded by fraternization, and this must in turn be offered by us, as Dr. Pierce notified us in 1848, "upon the basis of the Plan of Separation." Upon this "Plan of Separation" the Southern press generally bases its argument to show that our missions in the South are an aggression, and that our withdrawal to their northern boundary line is a just precedent-condition even to fraternization. It is our present purpose, in the light of the facts which we shall furnish, to try the question of the validity, and even reality, of this famous so-called "Plan of Separation."

It will be remembered that the first action proposed in the case of Bishop Andrews, in the General Conference of 1844, was to request him to resign his office, and that the action finally taken was the passage of the Finley substitute with a briefer and milder preamble, stating it to be "the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of his office so long as this impediment remains." The Southern delegates had, during the painful discussion, taken no steps toward an amicable adjustment of the difficulty, while their persistency had toned down the position of the Conference to the utmost possible point of concession.

Only acquiescence in the doctrine of a non-slaveholding Episcopacy or a separation from the Church remained to them. They chose the latter. Their proposed mode of accomplishing it was by a constitutional division, through the concurrent action of the General and Annual Conferences. This plan failed. Then, as a second step, fifty-one delegates from the thirteen slaveholding Conferences, together with one from Illinois, who seems, however, to have been counted out in all subsequent action, presented the following Declaration—the formal utterance of the intention of secession which had been so frequently threatened previous to the commencement of the session as well as during the debates:

"The delegates of the Conferences in the slaveholding States take leave to *declare* to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that the continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church; the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference; and especially the extra-judicial proceedings against Bishop Andrew, which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from

his office as Superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of this General Conference over these Conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding States."

This document was referred to a Committee of Nine, at the head of which was Rev. Dr. Robert Paine, now Bishop, and Chairman of the Board of Bishops of the Church South. The import of the action of the Committee we shall hereafter fully consider, but what they did was to prepare and present the following report:

The select Committee of Nine, to consider and report on the declaration of the delegates from the Conferences of the slaveholding States, beg leave to submit the following report:

Whereas, a declaration has been presented to this General Conference, with the signatures of fifty-one delegates of the body, from thirteen Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States, representing that, for various reasons enumerated, the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry and Church organization cannot be successfully accomplished by them under the jurisdiction of this General Conference, as now constituted; and,

Whereas, in the event of a separation, a contingency to which the declaration asks attention as not improbable, we esteem it the duty of this General Conference to meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity; therefore,

Resolved, by the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, 1. That, should the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the northern boundary of such connection: All the societies, stations, and Conferences adhering to the Church in the South, by a vote of the majority of the members of said societies, stations, and conferences, shall remain under the unmolested pastoral care of the Southern Church; and the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church shall in no wise attempt to organize Churches or societies within the limits of the Church South, nor shall they attempt to exercise any pastoral oversight therein; it being understood that the ministry of the South reciprocally observe the same rule in relation to stations, societies, and conferences, adhering by vote of a majority, to the Methodist Episcopal Church; provided also, that this rule shall apply only to societies, stations, and conferences bordering on the line of division, and not to interior charges, which shall, in all cases, be left to the care of that Church within whose territory they are situated.

2. That the ministers, local and traveling, of every grade and office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, may, as they prefer,

remain in that Church, or, without blame, attach themselves to the Church South.

3. *Resolved*, by the delegates of all the Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, That we recommend to all the Annual Conferences, at their first approaching sessions, to authorize a change of the sixth Restrictive Article, so that the first clause shall read thus: "They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Chartered Fund, to any other purpose than for the benefit of the traveling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children, and to such other purposes as may be determined upon by the votes of two thirds of the members of the General Conference."

4. That whenever the Annual Conferences, by a vote of three fourths of all their members voting on the third resolution, shall have concurred in the recommendation to alter the sixth Restrictive Article, the Agents at New York and Cincinnati shall, and they are hereby authorized and directed to, deliver over to any authorized agent or appointee of the Church South, should one be organized, all notes and book accounts against the ministers, Church members, or citizens within its boundaries, with authority to collect the same for the sole use of the southern Church, and that said Agents also convey to the aforesaid agent or appointee of the South all the real estate, and assign to him all the property, including presses, stock, and all right and interest connected with the printing establishment at Charleston, Richmond, and Nashville, which now belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church.

5. That when the Annual Conferences shall have approved the aforesaid change in the sixth Restrictive Article, there shall be transferred to the above agent of the Southern Church so much of the capital and produce of the Methodist Book Concern as will, with the notes, book accounts, presses, etc., mentioned in the last resolution, bear the same proportion to the whole property of said Concern that the traveling preachers in the Southern Church shall bear to all the traveling ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the division to be made on the basis of the number of traveling preachers in the forthcoming Minutes.

6. That the above transfer shall be in the form of annual payments of $25,000 per annum, and specifically in stock of the Book Concern, and in Southern notes and accounts due the establishment, and accruing after the first transfer mentioned above; and until the payments are made, the Southern Church shall share in all the net profits of the Book Concern, in the proportion that the amount due them, or in arrears, bears to all the property of the Concern.

7. That Nathan Bangs, George Peck, and James B. Finley be, and they are hereby appointed, commissioners to act in concert with the same number of commissioners appointed by the Southern organization, (should one be formed,) to estimate the amount

which will fall due to the South by the preceding rule, and to have full powers to carry into effect the whole arrangements proposed with regard to the division of property, should the separation take place. And if by any means a vacancy occur in this board of commissioners, the Book Committee at New York shall fill said vacancy.

8. That whenever any agents of the Southern Church are clothed with legal authority or corporate power to act in the premises, the Agents at New York are hereby authorized and directed to act in concert with said Southern agents, so as to give the provisions of these resolutions a legally binding force.

9. That all the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church in meeting-houses, parsonages, colleges, schools, conference funds, cemeteries, and of every kind within the limits of the Southern organization, shall be forever free from any claim set up on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, so far as this resolution can be of force in the premises.

10. That the Church so formed in the South shall have a common right to use all the copyrights in possession of the Book Concern at New York and Cincinnati at the time of the settlement by the commissioners.

11. That the Book Agents at New York be directed to make such compensation to the Conferences South, for their dividend from the Chartered Fund, as the commissioners above provided for shall agree upon.

12. That the bishops be respectfully requested to lay that part of this report requiring the action of the Annual Conferences before them as soon as possible, beginning with the New York Conference.—*Journal* of 1844, p. 135.

This is the falsely-called "Plan of Separation;" the "Report of the Committee of Nine on the Division of the Church," as the reporter of the debates labeled it; the "Deed of Separation," as Dr. Capers afterward facetiously styled it; the "Compact" of the response of the Southern Bishops.

The Committee only professed to "report on the Declaration of the Delegates from the Conferences of the Slaveholding States." It is, in fact, a "Report on the Declaration"—no more and no less.

I. UPON THESE STATEMENTS WE REMARK, FIRST, THAT THE ADOPTION OF THE POLICY PROPOSED BY THIS REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF NINE WAS PURELY AN ACT OF GRACE ON THE PART OF THE NORTHERN MAJORITY.

That Northern two thirds majority possessed the full power, and was completely master of the situation. At the first threat of the Southern delegates the Northern majority might

have unitedly and firmly said, "Gentlemen of the South, you can go out of the Methodist Episcopal General Conference and Church if that be your free choice; but you must go as a *secession*, leaving all the privileges, dignities, and properties behind you. You go as so many private laymen, able, no doubt, to reorganize a new Church, and reconstitute yourselves ministers on your own authority, but entitled to carry nothing out from the Church you abandon." These defenders of slavery must have gone out as truly a set of refugees, as the champions of freedom, the poor Wesleyans, did.

Against this course the Southern majority could not have uttered a valid argument. For, twenty years before, when the Methodism of Canada separated from our General Conference, it was allowed to take no part of the central property. And what conclusively shuts off all argument in the case of the Southern withdrawal is this glaring fact, that *upon the question whether Canadian Methodism should take a share of the property, the Southern vote was nearly unanimous in the negative!* The adoption of the plan proposed by the Committee of Nine was, therefore, a *gratuity*, which might and ought to have been withheld, a generosity without consideration or compensation, a most extraordinary and uncalled-for act of magnanimity.

Yet this act of GRACE has been, from almost the day of its adoption to the present hour, made the basis of action against us. It was upon the vantage ground gratuitously donated to them by this action that they have fought all their battles with us. Without this they could never have even attempted to erect a new Church under our authority; never have claimed a penny of Church property; never instituted a suit; never could have pretended that any "plan" excluded us from the occupancy of Southern territory. Such are the thanks sometimes paid for generous dealing—the using your magnanimity to strike you down with.

II. THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF NINE WAS NOT A "COMPACT," BUT SIMPLY A REPEALABLE ENACTMENT OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

The Southern Bishops, in their response, do indeed only repeat the sentiment that has been so often uttered that it has

acquired with them the force of undoubted truth. But a compact is a mutual agreement made by two equally independent parties—men, societies, or nations—with mutual stipulations and compensations, by which they are thenceforth bound, until broken by one or the other. This is the sense in which the Bishops employ the term, for they say "The separation was by compact, and mutual." But there were no equally independent parties in the General Conference; that body was *one*. Men were there from the South and from the North, indeed, but from the East, West, and Middle, as well. They were from different sections of the country and different Annual Conferences, but constituting one homogeneous body, one General Conference of the one Methodist Episcopal Church, assembled and working under the common authority of a written constitution. As a regular legislation under that constitution this enactment was passed, and by a regular constitutional enactment it could be (as it was by the ensuing General Conference) repealed. So that when our Southern brethren appeal to this pseudo "Plan of Separation," they appeal to a long since repealed enactment.

In order to a "compact" it is further necessary that there should be mutual compensations from one side to the other. But here it was all on one side. The "understanding" that the southern section should make no incursions into the northern section was no compensation for the withdrawal of General Conference jurisdiction. That jurisdiction owned both sides; and if it gave, it gave gratuitously, it being no compensation that those who had nothing to give in return should not grasp a larger amount. The fact is simply this: The "understanding" suggested a prospect of peace; and wishing peace, the General Conference simply enacted, that, under such a prospect, the ministers still remaining under its jurisdiction should confine themselves to certain boundaries. Whether that enactment should continue depended on two things: *First*, whether the General Conference still should continue to consider that such peace was desirable at such cost; and *second*, whether the peace were really attained. It was upon the failure of the last of these two motives that the General Conference of 1848, as we shall see, most wisely repealed the enactment.

III. The General Conference did not divide the Church, but simply made provision for quiet in case the South Seceded.

In the debates on the cases of Mr. Harding and Bishop Andrew threats of division and secession were freely made, the two terms being used as synonyms. The first specific step (before the Committee of Nine was contemplated) toward their accomplishment was in the resolutions of Dr. Capers, which proposed a division of the General Conference. The Committee held this to be impossible; or, as Dr. Capers himself said, they agreed that the thing sought "ought not to be done in the manner specified in the resolutions, or by any action on the resolutions." So division does not date there. Drs. Longstreet and Paine next prepared a plan similar to that of Dr. Capers, which was at once set aside. The next step (upon which the appointment of the Committee of Nine was based) was the Declaration above given, not asking for division, but calling attention to the coming separation of the South. After the appointment of the Committee of Nine, Mr. M'Ferrin's resolution instructed them conditionally to "devise, if possible, a constitutional plan for a mutual and friendly division of the Church." They did consider it, and found it not "possible;" and Dr. M'Ferrin's own statement, made a few months later, that "the General Conference did not assume the right to divide the Church," is conclusive upon the point that no division was based upon his resolution.

The Report treats of the division of *property*, but not of the *Church*. It speaks of the separation of persons from it, but always as their own act. It assumes "the event of a separation" as a "not impossible contingency," according to the "Declaration," and creating an "emergency" which the General Conference ought to "meet" in a Christian manner. The entire enactment is based upon one contingent fundamental condition, namely, "should the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection;" and its provisions relate exclusively to the course of the Methodist Episcopal Church consequent upon this action, and not at all to the course of the South. It gives no permission, sanction, or consent to that separation, which it anticipated somebody would make, but simply enacts that the separators

shall be let alone. Nor did they make a "Plan of Separation," but simply made restrictive enactments upon those who still adhered after certain others had separated.

With these views agree statements made by Southern delegates, not only in the debate on the report, but afterward. "Is the Methodist Episcopal Church divided?" asked Dr. Paine only a month after the adjournment. "No; the General Conference has no power to divide it. Ours was a delegated power, to be exercised under constitutional limitations, and for specific purposes." Mr. M'Ferrin said: "To be sure we did not divide the Church; to do this we had no authority." "The General Conference," he wrote in the beginning of 1845, "did not divide the Church. It only made provision for an amicable separation in case the Southern Conferences found it necessary to form a distinct organization. And when the General Conference adjourned, the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church still existed as before, complete and untouched. It would have remained so to the present hour had the Southern Conferences refrained from their unauthorized and unnecessary withdrawal from its jurisdiction."

The Convention for organizing the new Southern Church met at Louisville, Kentucky, in May, 1845, being one year subsequent to our General Conference. This Louisville Convention, in its instructions to the Committee on Organization to "inquire whether or not any thing has transpired to render it possible to maintain the unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church under the same General Conference jurisdiction," assumed and declared thereby that the "unity" of the Church was still complete and unbroken; that the supremacy of the General Conference was unimpaired; and, therefore, that neither the Church nor the General Conference had been divided or weakened by the Report of the Committee of Nine. Whatever view was afterward held by the South, the General Conference of 1844 did not divide the Church, that Convention being judge. In May, 1845, the Methodist Episcopal Church had not separated from the South; neither it nor any of its loyal Conferences was represented in the Convention, and no act of separation of a later date can be discovered; yet the Southern Bishops tell us, "we separated from you in no sense in which you did not separate from us!"

Good men could not contemplate the probable angry feelings and collisions consequent on a violent dismemberment of the Church without a shudder, and a desire to do something to prevent them. Ill-advised as its results prove it to have been, the Report of the Committee of Nine was designed, and by its friends publicly claimed to be, a "*a peace measure*," a measure by which brethren who had labored together in love might not part in bitterness, that would save Societies and Conferences from internal strife and schism, preserve order and quiet on the border, and thus render the secession which the South might inaugurate, peaceable, and as lightly injurious as possible, instead of violent and disastrous. True, it was not styled a secession, and Southern delegates begged that the term might not be applied to them; and, such was the spirit of kindness that prevailed, the more euphonious and agreeable word "separation" (a generic term under which *secession* is a specific) was employed, although all concerned knew full well that defining secession as *an illegal withdrawal from a legal jurisdiction*, it was in fact a SECESSION, and nothing else.

IV. NOT ONLY DID THE GENERAL CONFERENCE CREATE NO DIVISION, BUT NO POWER EXISTS IN THAT BODY TO DIVIDE THE CHURCH.

It was constituted to preserve, not to destroy; to govern, not to dissolve; to strengthen in unity, not to divide. It has "full power to make rules and regulations for our Church," with certain specified exceptions, not for overthrow or destruction, but for perpetuity and efficiency, adapting them always to the purposes for which the Church was organized. Regulations for those purposes involving a change in the organization, as in division, destroy the Church, for the destruction of its organization is the destruction of itself. And with all its power the General Conference cannot place an Annual Conference beyond its jurisdiction or the supervision of "our itinerant general superintendency," which it would assuredly do in creating a division. Nor can it so disconnect a Conference or Society, a minister or member, from the Church, as to take away guaranteed rights of trial and appeal in regular judicatories of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Church South is outside of its jurisdiction as much as is the Presbyterian or Episcopal Church, and however similar to, or identical with, ours, its rules

and privileges may be, it is another organization, for which neither at its inception nor now can our General Conference make rules and regulations. Had, then, that body in 1844 directly or indirectly divided the Church, it would have transcended its power, and the act would have been void. Moreover, the General Conference, as often as it has acted or spoken on the subject, has always asserted that it had no power to divide the Church. This was conspicuously so in the case of Canada, and in 1844 it was, as we have seen, repeatedly declared. Had the General Conference of 1844 believed itself to possess this power it would, in the opinion of many, undoubtedly have exercised it; for confidence in the statements and Christian honesty of Southern delegates, and sympathy for them in the embarrasments which it was believed they must encounter, were so great, that the disposition was general to go to the farthest point of legal right and authority to meet the emergency of the hour. But its members felt and professed a constitutional inability to effect a division.

V. STILL FURTHER, THE GENERAL CONFERENCE HAD NO INTENTION, AND BY THE WORDING OF THE DOCUMENT ITSELF GAVE NO CONSENT, TO DIVIDE THE CHURCH.

We prove this from the terms of the report above presented. They had no division in view, but rather a secession, which, for delicacy's sake, they denominated a "separation." "In the event of a separation," says the report; "should the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection;" "the Church in the South;" "the Southern Church;" "the Church South;" "the Church South, should one be organized;" "the South;" "the Southern organization, should one be formed;" "should the separation take place;" "the Southern organization;" "the Church so formed in the South:"—these are the words, and all the words, of the report which indicate the new Church, or the mode of its coming into being. All the separation is to be done by the South. They merely assume that a distinct ecclesiastical organization may come into being by the action of the Southern Conferences, those Conferences themselves being the judges whether they will do it, taking into their own hands the entire responsibility, and say, "Should the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding States find it necessary to unite

in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed;" which rule did not prescribe, advise, or intimate any method of their going, but only the conduct of the Methodist Episcopal Church in case they went.

Most singular, unprecedented, and unkind would have been the conduct which intended to divide the Church so as to constitute two distinct Churches, and yet took no steps and uttered no words by which the several fragments should be reorganized, or by which the members within, or the world without, should for seven years be aware of what had occurred, and then only through the opinion of Judge Nelson. The report represents the Methodist Episcopal Church as still existing, holding its well-known name and its organization unimpaired; and as to another Church, it provided for no convention, ordained no steps for its legitimate organization, or tests of its Methodistic fidelity, and expressed no wish respecting its future. These omissions are unaccountable on the supposition of an intention to divide, or a consent to a division.

VI. SECESSION, EITHER VIOLENT OR PEACEFUL, WAS A PREDETERMINED FACT ON THE PART OF THE SOUTH.

Until a then recent period it had been the purpose of all sections to preserve the Episcopacy free from connection with slavery, and no slaveholder had ever been elected to that high office. But the revolution that ultimately pronounced slavery to be not a "moral evil," caused slaveholding ministers to feel restive under this system of exclusion from the highest office of the Church. It was indeed a powerful, though tacit, rebuke of the system; and, if slavery were not a "moral evil," it was right that ownership of slaves should cease to be a practical disqualification for the episcopacy, provided it did not interfere with the work of a general itinerant superintendent. So great was the change, that the failure in 1836 to elect a slaveholder, which was then for the first time claimed upon the floor of the General Conference as a right and a necessity, was followed by a meeting of southern delegates, in which the question of secession was opened and discussed. To Dr. W. A. Smith, we believe, belongs the unenviable notoriety of first demanding in print measures preparatory to secession, and the organization of a "Southern General Conference," if what was termed "this proscriptive system" should not be abandoned. This strange

seed, sown in 1836, took root in a well-prepared and fertile soil; and the new doctrine continued lustily to grow. As the General Conference of 1844 approached, while some of the wisest, like Dr. Capers, desired the election to the episcopacy of the best men irrespective of locality or relation to slavery, the prevalent feeling was that the future of the South lay in one of three things: (1) the election of a slaveholding Bishop, (2) degradation, by the denial of their right, or, (3) secession. The first they knew they could not secure; to the second they were resolved not to submit; and secession was the only open course.

The marriage of Bishop Andrew hushed all discussion, and drove the entire Southern ministry upon one platform. The innovators had suddenly, and perhaps unexpectedly, triumphed: they had what they wanted. Thenceforth this slaveholding Bishop, already in hand, must be sustained or the South must secede. These passages of history throw light upon the language of Southern delegates in the General Conference of 1844, showing that their threats of secession were not the offspring of the hour, but the utterance of a predetermined purpose. They explain why Bishop Andrew was not allowed to resign, as he proposed. It was less *he* than the question of a slaveholding episcopate that was on trial. The disposal of the Harding case foreshadowed the fate of the Bishop, and was held to be the "knell of division and disunion." So said Dr. Winans: "If you pass this action in the mildest form, you will leave us no option but to be disconnected with your body." Said Mr. Drake, "Bishop Andrew must be continued in the Episcopal office, or you certainly divide the Church." "I regard the question of unity as settled," said Mr. G. F. Pierce, "by the previous action of the Conference in another case." Mr. Dunwoody said, "If this course were persevered in they would force the South to secede." Dr. Smith said, "The Southern men declared that they would secede should the Bishop be touched." The case was most adroitly put: "We shall secede if the Bishop be touched; if, therefore, you touch him after this warning, you coerce us into secession, and upon yourselves will be the responsibility and wrong of the rupture." "The separation was completed *in fact*," Dr. Lee wrote, "when the Secretary counted up the ayes and noes on the resolution of Mr. Finley." In the steps preparatory to secession we find a unity and firmness that only a previously-

formed purpose could have produced. The Declaration was the first formal act, the beginning of the movement; the Protest, a defense of the intended secession rather than a testimony against the action taken, the second; and the unparliamentary resistance to the Reply as taking away the foundation on which they meant to build, the third. The fourth is explicable only on the ground of a determined secession. The report made the fifty-one delegates the judges of the necessity of separation; but it was so changed that the Annual Conferences, and not the delegates, were to find the necessity, if it existed at all, and the necessity found must be produced in the South by the action of the General Conference alone.

Southern delegates solemnly pledged themselves to use their utmost endeavors to quiet their people. Dr. Paine is reported to have said in the debate: "The separation would not be effected by the passage of these resolutions through the General Conference. They must pass the Annual Conferences, beginning at New York, and when they came round to the South, the preachers there would think, and deliberate, and feel the pulse of public sentiment and of the members of the Church." Southern delegates professed a hope that separation would be found unnecessary, and some of them gave assurances that they would do their utmost to produce quiet in the minds of their people. And it was certainly needful for them to return home before they could properly judge of the necessities of the case. Nevertheless, on the day after the adjournment, and while yet at the seat of the General Conference, these fifty-one delegates, before any of the contingencies stated in the report occurred, issued an Address to the ministers and members in the South, inflaming the public mind, arguing the case of the "proposed separation," and pronouncing judgment upon the question of necessity, thus creating opinion, and forestalling the action of the Annual Conferences. They further appointed a convention, to be held at Louisville, and prescribed the mode of the election of its members. The question of a separation was thus virtually decided by this schismatic action of the delegates themselves; and nothing else can be inferred than that they intended it to be so. They did not "find" the necessity, but created it. They kindled the fire, and the Southern press and Conferences fanned the flame.

VII. The act of Overt Secession was first committed by the Louisville Convention.

That body spoke various lofty words, and made various loftier assumptions, which had no shadow of foundation in fact, and which can only astonish him who reads its proceedings with what it calls "The Provisional Plan of Separation" in his hand. The very assembling of the Convention was without direction, authority, advice, consent, or knowledge of the General Conference. It professed to act upon the authority of the so-called "Plan;" but that so-called "Plan" gave no authority to act; and if it had, as it had not been confirmed by the Annual Conferences it was utterly void. It claimed the "Plan" as "provisional" for the action of the South in effecting a separation; whereas its provisions were for *the action of the Church separated from*, not for the action of the separatists; and the principal ones could have no effect until the voluntary secession of the South should be completed. It affirmed that the General Conference authorized a division of jurisdiction, for which the facts furnish no apology, since the General Conference could not delegate to the Convention powers which itself never possessed. It pretended to renounce only the "jurisdiction of the General Conference" in forming the new Church, which it held did "not affect either the moral or legal unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church;" it then gave to this new organization a distinct name, putting itself outside, and at the same time claiming still to be in the old Church; and finally, by a species of legerdemain impenetrable to the unsophisticated, it turns around with an assurance that it will be "always ready to entertain, and duly and carefully consider, *any proposition or plan* having for its object the union of the two" Churches, "whether such proposed union be *jurisdictional or connectional*," thus admitting its absolute and entire severance from the Methodist Episcopal Church. We commend this clause to the Southern Bishops, as warranting a different and nobler reply to the overture for a reunion than their requirement that our proffer must be made "upon the basis of the Plan of Separation." We have come to them with a proposition upon a platform of a later date—their own resolutions of organization.

The Convention instructed the Committee on Organization, on certain conditions, to "report in favor of a separation from

the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of said General Conference;" and the report having been made, it unanimously declared the jurisdiction of the General Conference over the Conferences there represented "*entirely dissolved*," and that those Conferences "hereby are *constituted* a separate ecclesiastical connection, to be known by the style and title of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South." All this, it is true, was said to be done by the members of the Convention "acting under the Provisional Plan of Separation;" but we have seen that there was no plan of separation, and the enactment of non-interference, if the Southerners separated, gave no authority for such action by them or any other persons. Their powers were assumed. There was *an illegal withdrawal from a legal jurisdiction.* The dissolving and constituting were their own work, done then and there, AND THAT WORK WAS SECESSION.

VIII. WHAT IS CALLED BY THE SOUTH THE "PLAN OF SEPARATION" HAS BEEN ABUNDANTLY VIOLATED BY THE SOUTH, IN OVERPASSING ITS BOUNDARIES.

The report of the Committee of Nine directed Bishops and Ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church to exercise no pastoral oversight in Societies, Stations, and Conferences south of the northern boundary of the thirteen Conferences that should by vote adhere to the Southern Church, "it being understood," not enjoined, or even mutually agreed, "that the ministry of the South reciprocally observe the same rule in relation to stations," etc., upon the border south of the same line, adhering to the Methodist Episcopal Church. The report applied, as will be seen by its wording, only to the territory of the thirteen declaring Conferences, as their boundaries stood in 1844. The Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Ohio, and other Conferences were not among those Conferences; and yet the Louisville Convention authorized crossing the line into their territory. Societies were to adhere "by a vote of the majority of the members;" but the Convention claimed those that did not vote at all, even north of the line, as "constructively" belonging to the South. The Bishops of the Southern Church called upon border Societies in the non-protesting Conferences to vote; they made the boundary a movable line northward, and appointed preachers to numerous charges where only a minority had voted for adherence to the South; and

Southern editors, leading ministers, and their General Conference sanctioned their proceedings. Bishop Capers, by an after-thought, claimed the entire territory of the slaveholding States, at least; and in their administration the Board of Bishops concurred in appointing pastors to "interior Societies" in the free States. The facts have entered into the record of history, and constitute a shameful chapter of violations of good faith.

We do not dispute the actual right of the Church South, after its organization, to enter wherever it might find an open door. Our argument is, that while professing to act within, and to be governed by, a certain so-called "Plan," the validity of which is insisted on to the present day, the infractions of it in the point in which it was "understood" that special fidelity was to be exhibited have been such, so many, and so great, inaugurated by the Convention, practiced by the administration, and approved by the General Conference, that they destroyed the boundary line and overthrew the "Plan." It only remained, therefore, to be pronounced by our General Conference of 1848 what the South had already made it, "null and void."

IX. Assuming that the report of the Committee of Nine is, as is claimed, truly a "Compact," by a well understood principle of law the parties framing it are mutually bound by it, and if broken by one it is no longer binding on the other, and may be so declared. Thus, our National Congress in 1798 declared the treaties with France to be no longer obligatory upon the United States, as they had been in repeated instances violated by France. We affirm, then, that the South, in violating the conditions of this so-called "Compact," rendered it no longer of binding force upon the Methodist Episcopal Church. We find that in the so-called "Compact" it is, to adopt the later Southern phraseology, *stipulated* that "whenever the Annual Conferences, by a vote of three fourths of all their members voting on the third resolution, shall have concurred in the recommendation to alter the Sixth Restrictive Article, the Agents at New York and Cincinnati shall, and they are hereby, authorized and directed," etc., to give a moiety of the central property. The delivery, by the Agents, of notes, accounts, presses, newspapers, stock, depository, and other General Conference property in the South, and a proportionate share of the Book

Concerns, was required to be subsequent to the change of the Rule. "*Whenever*," and not until then! This is the word and the idea reported by Bishop Paine, voted for by the Southern delegates, and adopted by the General Conference with only thirteen dissenting voices. The South thus precluded itself (by their so-called "Compact") from seeking any portion of this property in any other way than by a change of the Rule. It *stipulated* (by "compact") to go without this property in the North, and also to let alone all General Conference property in the South, until the Rule should be changed, and *forever, if it should not be changed.* Now what did it do? Before the Rule was altered, and without waiting for a second trial, which might and might not be made, to alter it—and whether one would or would not have been made is immaterial to the present point—the first General Conference of the Church South, which met at Petersburgh, Va., May, 1846, ordered the books, notes, presses, etc., of the papers within its territory, and the Charleston depository—the forts and arsenals of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South—to be seized and confiscated to the use of the Church South, turning out the officers in charge of them, an example ingloriously followed by their revolutionary successors in their so-called Constitutional Separation from the United States! True, the Book Agent to whose custody they were committed was directed to "hold the same, subject to a division according to the Plan of Separation," of course; but whether such a direction, under the circumstances, savors more of the comic or the infatuated, is difficult to tell. Certain it is that neither Conference nor Agent had a right to touch them, "according to the Plan of Separation." In so doing it broke the so-called "Compact," made it of no force upon the Methodist Episcopal Church, and forever precluded itself and its Bishops from basing upon it any pretense whatever.

X. In this report of the Committee of Nine it was enacted that, in case the South separated, the Methodist Episcopal Church should refrain from pastoral acts within a given territory; that certain property should (with ratification of our Annual Conferences) be given to the Church South; and that compensation should be made for a fair proportion of the Chartered Fund. The required antecedents were, that a *necessity should exist*, a necessity produced by the action of our General

Conference, and found to be such by the Southern Annual Conferences; that the Annual Conferences should, in compliance with the recommendation of the General Conference, consent to the change of the Sixth Restrictive Rule; and that a fraternal spirit should be exhibited by the South corresponding to that enjoined upon the Methodist Episcopal Church. Never before was an intended secession met with a purer Christian liberality.

What measure of excitement the action of our General Conference produced, or what necessity would have been found to result from it, or what judgment our Annual Conferences would have pronounced had Southern delegates fulfilled their pledges, and waited the natural order of events, it is impossible to tell. It is only known that the fifty-one delegates kindled the fire which swept all before it, making retreat impossible, and secession a certainty. If they issued any address at all, it should have been loyal and peaceful; but they, on the other hand, "call attention to the *proscription* and *disability* under which the Southern portion of the Church must of necessity labor," and prejudge the entire question. They professed to wait for the action of their people; but they, at the same time, threw their powerful influence on the side of disruption, by pronouncing their opinion formed on the spot. They call the convention, apportion the delegates, and require instruction of them by the Annual Conferences, and then, in defiance of the expressed will of the General Conference, they schismatically and rebelliously request Bishop Andrew, "as far as is in his power, to attend and preside in our Conferences." Such facts induced the General Conference of 1848 to believe that the separation did not result from "a state of things in the South 'provoked' by the action of the General Conference," but from the "revolutionary measures adopted by the Southern delegates," and that the calling of the Convention, and issuing the address, were "an abandonment of the Plan, and therefore that it had been of no real force since June 11, 1844.

Our General Conference of 1848 also found that the requisite vote for the alteration of the Rule had not been given; that in numerous instances the rule relating to boundaries had been violated by the South; and that several thousands of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church complained of the deprivation of their disciplinary rights by the operation of this so-called

"Plan of Separation." The action of that body was, therefore, proper and right which said, "Having found, upon clear and incontestable evidence, that the three fundamental conditions of said proposed Plan have severally failed, and the failure of either of them separately being sufficient to render it null and void, and having found the practical workings of said Plan incompatible with certain great constitutional principles elsewhere asserted, we have found and declared *the whole and every part of said Provisional Plan to be null and void.*"

To all the above arguments we know that the South considers it a conclusive reply to say: The adoption of the report of the Committee of Nine was a division of the Church, for we brought it before the Supreme Court of the United States, and that Court decided it to be a division. Our reply is, That as secular law, whether expounded or manufactured by that Court, requiring the division of property, we obeyed the decision: but as deciding for us a moral or ecclesiastical question, that decision has no more value or force than the opinion of any other equal number of equally able lawyers. That same Court, by the mouth of Robert Taney, a name of evil omen in judicial history, decided that no negro was a citizen, or possessed any rights which any man is bound to respect; and to-day a negro sits in the senatorial seat of Jefferson Davis! The decision against us was made when Slavery was in the height of its power; when President, and Congress, and Courts were the humble tools of slavery, and when political parties were bowing in prostration before the slave-power. A decision in favor of the South and Slavery by that Court was a foregone conclusion upon any case. The South would have received the contested property without any "Plan of Separation." It was a great oversight in the Southern delegates not to claim to be the Methodist Episcopal Church and the true proprietors of the Book Concern, all of which that Court would have no doubt accorded to them. But could that case but come before the Supreme Court of to-day, what Southerner dreams that the action of the General Conference would be pronounced a division of the Church?

Our review leads us to the following conclusion: That the so-called "Plan of Separation" was not a "compact" framed for the division of the Church, but a law prescribing the course of the Methodist Episcopal Church in a given contingency;

that the conditions upon which it was based having failed, it was found to be null and void, and was so declared; that the separation was not the result of a necessity found to have been produced by the action of the General Conference, but of a necessity created by the revolutionary action of the fifty-one delegates; that the proceedings of the Louisville Convention had only nominally any connection with the report of the Committee of Nine; and that the formation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, being an illegal withdrawal from a legal jurisdiction, was, and is, a SECESSION.

To our General Conference of 1848 there came Dr. Lovick Pierce, accredited as a delegate of fraternal courtesy from the Church South, but not empowered to negotiate in regard to their encroachments upon our territory, or violation of our rights of property. His official mission was by us rejected. The charge has latterly been bandied from paper to paper of the Southern Methodist press that Dr. Pierce was personally treated by our General Conference with discourtesy. This is their settled and resentful assumption. On what proof they rely we know not; but we have the best of proof, namely, Dr. Pierce's own statement, that the *personal* treatment he received required his grateful acknowledgment. The response of the General Conference was to the following effect:

Whereas, a letter from Rev. L. Pierce, D.D., delegate of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, proposing fraternal relations between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has been presented to this Conference; and whereas, there are serious questions and difficulties existing between the two bodies; therefore,

Resolved, That while we *tender to the Rev. Dr. Pierce all personal courtesies, and invite him to attend our sessions*, this General Conference does not consider it proper, at present, to enter into fraternal relations with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

The following amendment was added by the Conference:

"Provided, however, that nothing in this resolution shall be so construed as to operate as a bar to any propositions from Dr. Pierce, or any other representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, toward the settlement of existing difficulties between that body and this."

Dr. Elliott says:

"Dr. Pierce did not come to settle or acknowledge difficulties on the part of the Church South. He came, "in the unity of

Wesleyan Methodism," to be received, and, through him, the Church South to be received as a sound branch of Wesleyan Methodism, after all that had passed. . . . Dr. Pierce, however, was treated with great courtesy by all. He was invited, by subsequent resolution, to a seat within the bar, with the explanation that such was the meaning and design of the action of the Conference in his case.

Dr. Pierce's final letter to our General Conference was as follows:

To the Bishops and Members of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church:

Rev. and Dear Brethren: I have received two extracts from your Journal of the 4th and 5th instant. From these extracts I learn you decline receiving me in my proper character as the accredited delegate of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and only *invite me to a seat within the bar as due to me on account of my private and personal merits. These considerations I shall appreciate, and will reciprocate them with you in all the private walks of Christian and social life. But within the bar of the General Conference I can only be known in my official character.*

You will, therefore, regard this communication as final on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. She can never renew the offer of fraternal relations between the two great bodies of Wesleyan Methodists in the United States. But the proposition can be renewed at any time, either now or hereafter, by the Methodist Episcopal Church. And if ever made upon *the basis of the Plan of Separation*, as adopted by the General Conference of 1844, the Church South will cordially entertain the proposition.

With sentiments of deep regard, and with feelings of disappointed hope, I am yours, in Christian fellowship,

L. Pierce,
Delegate from the M. E. Church, South.

Pittsburgh, *May* 9, 1848.

The above testimony appears conclusively to exonerate our General Conference from the charge of personal discourtesy; at the same time it strikes the key-note of a fraternization upon the basis of an imaginary "Plan of Separation." Whether our next General Conference should or should not take any action on the subject of fraternal interchange with the Church South we offer no opinion. But it is clear that if a settlement of all outstanding complaints is to be a condition precedent to fraternity, the account runs over a long back series.

Note.—Our Southern friends will please not identify the writer of the above article with the editor of our Quarterly. W.

Art. VII.—WESLEY'S SEPARATION FROM THE MORAVIANS.

*An Appendix to Dr. L. S. Jacoby's new History of Methodism.**

TRANSLATED BY W. F. WARREN.

We have already stated the causes on account of which Wesley separated from the Moravian Brethren; nevertheless, for the sake of placing the character of the Founder of Methodism and the real nature of these causes in their proper light, we will here explain them more at length.

John Wesley freely acknowledged that he had been led to a living faith by these brethren, and he cherished feelings of warm affection and regard toward them. He greatly desired to personally acquaint himself with the Church, members of which had become such loved instrumentalities to the salvation of his soul. Hence his journey in 1738 to Marienborn and Herrnhut. Of the ensuing events an impartial author, Dr. K. H. Sack, Professor and Councilor of the Consistory at Bonn, has recently given the following account. "What delightful, yea, blessed impressions Wesley received from this people, appears in every paragraph of his Diary.† But, alas! it did not, perhaps could not and should not, so continue. From the close of the year 1739 Wesley believed he saw dangerous Antinomian and mystical opinions in the London Moravian Society with which he and his friends had united, also opinions which involved the doctrine of the universal restorationism. This pained him the more, from the fact that a portion of his hearers and adherents were disturbed and alienated from him by these opinions. In view of Wesley's profound conviction, that those who by grace have obtained justification through faith must feel themselves impelled to the greatest

* Geschichte des Methodismus seiner Entstehung und Ausbreitung in den verschiedenen Theilen der Erde. Erster Theil: Geschichte des Brittischen Methodismus, und der Ausbreitung desselben in den Brittischen Colonien. So wie die Geschichte seiner Missionen. Von L. S. Jacoby. Bremen. 1870.

† The following remark, therefore, in the History of the Renewed Church of the Brethren must be pronounced incorrect, as far as it relates to Wesley: "At this time there came to Marienborn, from England, the Methodists Benjamin Ingham and John Wesley; the former was mightily attracted by the spirit of the Society and the frankness of the brethren, not so the latter—he found more in Halle." Part I, p. 330.

moral earnestness and to a zealous observance of God's commandments, there is no sort of necessity for assuming any selfish motive in explanation of the opposition which he now commenced.* During the first half of the year 1740 Wesley exerted himself to combat, by sermons and conversations, the errors which showed themselves in the Society. But the dissension became ever greater until Wesley, whom his opponents had repeatedly charged with heresy, on the 20th of July of that year publicly read, in a meeting in Fetter Lane, a paper in which he designated those points in their doctrine which, according to his judgment, were contrary to the word of God. On that day he disconnected himself from the Society, and from that time forward held his own meetings in another place. Thereupon he addressed a letter, under date of Aug. 8, 1740, to the Society in Herrnhut, with this superscription, "John Wesley, a presbyter of the Church of God in England, to the Church of God at Herrnhut, in Upper Lusatia." In this epistle he shows them what is taught among them contrary to the Gospel, or what it is, at least, not forbidden to teach. His language is free, and here and there strong; but most of the propositions and opinions quoted in the letter are, beyond a question, suspicious in the highest degree, while others perhaps could be condemned only from a one-sidedly moral standpoint. He especially declared himself against the following doctrines and practices, to wit: that believers properly have nothing more to perform as commandment or duty; that one can have justifying faith and not know it; that there is no such thing as weak faith; that one need not use the means of grace, not even prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, until by faith one has obtained a pure heart; that the brethren were not open enough toward such as sinned before their eyes; that they undervalued good works, etc. Nevertheless, love beams through the earnestness of the warning, for he writes at the commencement, "I believe you to be dear children of God, through faith which is in Jesus."

In the spring of 1741 Spangenberg came to London, and having been commissioned by Count Zinzendorf to seek for a reconcilia-

* We may therefore designate as an unfair judgment what Risler says in his Life of Spangenberg, p. 178, (Barby, 1794,) namely, that Wesley was envious of the Moravian Brethren because many of his followers joined them.

tion, exerted himself to effect it. To use his own language, "On account of our mother's children who are still angry with us, we have given ourselves great pains."* All was in vain. The divergence of opinions and modes of feeling had already become too considerable. Toward the end of this year the last attempt at reconciliation took place, but it also failed. Zinzendorf had come to London the first of September, 1741, and already on the third of the month he made appointment for a conference with Wesley.†

Of the conversation, which was held in Latin, the following is a literal translation. The original is found not only in Wesley's diary, but also in Büding's "Collections," published under Zinzendorf's own supervision, in which it appeared in the year 1745.

Zinzendorf. Why have you changed your religion.

Wesley. I am not aware that I have changed my religion. Why do you think so? Who has told you this?

Z. Plainly, yourself. I see it from your letter to us. In that, having abandoned the religion which you professed among us, you profess a new one.

W. How so? I do not understand you.

Z. Yea, you say there that true Christians are not miserable sinners. This is most false. The best of men are most miserable sinners, even unto death. If any say otherwise, they are either wholly impostors, or diabolically led astray. Our brethren, teachers of better things, you have opposed; and have refused peace to them desiring it.

W. I do not yet understand what you mean.

Z. When you wrote to me from Georgia I loved you very much. I perceived that you were then simple in heart. You wrote again; I saw that you were still simple in heart, but disordered in your ideas. You came among us; your ideas were then still more disordered and confused. You returned to England. Some time after I heard that our brethren were contending with you. I sent Spangenberg to effect a reconciliation between you. He wrote to me that the Brethren had injured you. I wrote back that they should not only desist, but even ask your pardon. Spangenberg wrote again that they had asked it; but that you, boasting of these things, were unwilling to be at peace. Now, being come, I hear the same.

W. The matter by no means turns on that point. Your breth-

* See "Life of Spangenberg," p. 178. The remark on page 177, "When others preach of their perfection, we glory in our misery and weakness, and that a lamb is slain for us," must be understood as referring to Wesley.

† The diary of John Wesley on his journey to Germany in 1738, and his conference with Zinzendorf, anno 1741. Niedner's "Zeitschrift für historische Theologie." 1864. 2d Heft. [The foot-notes are all by Dr. Sack. Tr.]

ren (it is so far true) did treat me ill. Afterward they asked my pardon. I answered that that was superfluous; that I had never been angry with them, but was afraid, 1. That there was error in their doctrine. 2. That there was sin (allowed) in their practice. This was then, and is at this day, the only question between them and me.

Z. Speak more plainly.

W. I feared that there was error in their doctrine: 1. Concerning the end of our faith in this life, to wit, Christian Perfection. 2. Concerning the means of grace, so called by our Church.

Z. I acknowledge no inherent perfection in this life. This is the error of errors. I pursue it through the world with fire and sword—I trample it under foot—I exterminate it. Christ is our only perfection. Whoever follows after inherent perfection denies Christ.

W. But I believe that the Spirit of Christ works perfection in true Christians.

Z. Not at all. All our perfection is in Christ. All Christian perfection is imputed, not inherent. We are perfect in Christ—in ourselves never.

W. We contend, I think, about words. Is not every true believer holy?

Z. Certainly. But he is holy in Christ, not in himself.

W. But does he not live holily?

Z. Yes, he lives holily in all things.

W. Has he not also a holy heart?

Z. Most certainly.

W. Is he not, consequently, holy in himself?

Z. No, no. In Christ only. He is not holy in himself. In himself he has no holiness at all.

W. Has he not the love of God and his neighbor in his heart? Yea, even the whole image of God?

Z. He has. But these constitute legal, not evangelical, holiness. Evangelical holiness is—faith.

W. The dispute is altogether about words. You grant that the whole heart and the whole life of a believer are holy; that he loves God with all his heart, and serves him with all his strength. I ask nothing more; I mean nothing else by Christian perfection or holiness.

Z. But this is not his holiness. He is not more holy if he loves more, nor less holy if he loves less.

W. What! Does not a believer, while he increases in love, increase equally in holiness?

Z. By no means. The moment he is justified he is sanctified wholly. From that time, even unto death, he is neither more nor less holy.

W. Is not, then, a father in Christ more holy than a new-born babe?

Z. No. Entire sanctification and justification are in the same instant; and neither is increased or diminished.

W. But does not a believer grow daily in the love of God? Is he perfect in love as soon as he is justified?

Z. He is. He never increases in the love of God; he loves entirely in that moment, as he is entirely sanctified.

W. What, then, does the Apostle Paul mean by "We are renewed day by day?"

Z. I will tell you. Lead, if it be changed into gold, is gold the first day, and the second, and the third; and so it is renewed day by day. But it is never more gold than on the first day.

W. I thought we ought to grow in grace.

Z. Certainly; but not in holiness. As soon as any one is justified, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit dwell in his heart; and in that moment his heart is as pure as it ever will be. A babe in Christ is as pure in heart as a father in Christ. There is no difference.

W. Were not the Apostles justified before the death of Christ?

Z. They were.

W. But were they not more holy after the day of Pentecost than before the death of Christ?

Z. Not in the least.

W. Were they not on that day filled with the Holy Ghost?

Z. They were. But that gift of the Spirit had no reference to their holiness; it was the gift of miracles only.

W. Perhaps I do not understand you. Do we not, while we deny ourselves, more and more die to the world and live to God?

Z. We spurn all (self) denial; we trample it under foot. Being believers, we do whatever we will, and nothing more. We ridicule all mortification. No purification precedes perfect love.

W. What you have said, God assisting me, I will thoughtfully consider.

On this conversation the author of an article on Methodism, in the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" for 1840, (the late Professor Hengstenberg's organ,) very justly remarks: "It is truly astonishing how Zinzendorf could himself have caused this conversation, passages of which sound like a malevolent caricature of his doctrines, to be copied just as it stands, word for word, into the "Büding Collection." Into what dangerous phantasies did his excessive pressure of the doctrine of the atonement here betray him! He not merely maintains what the Evangelical Church has ever taught, that before justification there can be no sanctification; that before and apart from the righteousness of faith there can be no righteousness of life; but he denies, out and out, all righteousness of life, and places himself upon a stand-point so ideal as to represent the believer as no longer living in time, but as already in full possession of

what he is to receive hereafter. To hold fast this fantastical idealism, how must the Moravian brotherhood at that time have forsaken the healthful nourishment of Scripture, which so often speaks of a becoming more perfect in love—of a race toward the mark, during which one has not yet attained—of a perfecting of holiness in the fear of God. How must they have turned away from all this to intoxicate their feelings with their morbid hymns, in which the words 'blood and wounds' are a hundred times repeated! God be thanked, that they afterward purged themselves from this dross, and thus became a blessing to so many. In no case, however, can we justify Spangenberg, who certainly was acquainted with this conversation, (he refers to the 'Büding Collection,') when he represents in his 'Life of Zinzendorf,' (Part IV, p. 1,046,) that the grand point of difference between Wesley and the Brotherhood was the doctrine of the former respecting sinless perfection."

The same writer shows that the other declarations of the Moravians were as little satisfactory to Wesley as those of the Count in this conversation—the diversity of doctrine with respect to faith and its fruits was too great.

"In the manifesto of the Moravian Society at Marienborn with respect to the Methodistic movement, which document was undoubtedly the production of Zinzendorf, it is stated: 'Jesus's passion is our proper *fides justificans*—our justifying faith; his faithfulness, his intercession, his acquired right, justified us through the election of grace before the foundation of the world. In this sense all children of God are justified before they have knowledge of it; from the hour when they believe it they know it. This faith, however, is no work nor proper merit by which we can, as it were, force God to be gracious, as certain divines have incautiously taught, sometimes confounding miracle-faith with faith in the merits of Jesus. In order to faith in Jesus nothing is needed but the heart; the understanding only makes the enjoyment of it sensible, distinct, and enduring. Miracle-faith, on the other hand, has its seat in the understanding, and with it one may be lost. 1 Cor. xiii. It demands an absolute *plerophoria*, without the least doubt. The faith which is unto salvation remains in the heart ever the same, and cleaves inseparably to Jesus's wounds; in the understanding, however, especially according to the current method of conversion, it is subject to all sorts of offenses, through which there may result an *oligopistia* with respect to hours and days. We, however, in our Societies esteem it a precious

and gracious gift of the Saviour that he has permitted us to find the simple old way, in which one stops with his heart, holds himself to the grace which he has obtained, to the forgiveness of sins which he has received, to the death of Jesus, which has become present with us, and counts all that the understanding, temperament, constitution, the tabernacle may from that time on object as unworthy a moment's thought, only letting one's self be driven ever anew to sigh for the Lamb that is slain for us. One has not seen it, but one loves it. That is what we call an abiding witness of the Holy Spirit, who no more ceases to make intercessions for us with groanings than the Saviour does to pray for us.'—*Büding's Collection.*

"It is no wonder that this representation did not satisfy a man of so sharp an understanding as Wesley. In fact, the witness of the Holy Spirit is too completely subjectified, when it is said that 'one holds himself to the grace *which he has obtained*,' a thing that must of necessity weaken the assurance of faith: and worse yet, at the outset justification is confounded with satisfaction, for it is wholly false that 'the children of God are just before they have knowledge of it; from that hour when they believe it, they know it.' According to this, the forgiveness of sin would be no act of God, but something occurring merely in the consciousness of man; all men (or the elect, according as one connects a particularistic doctrine of election with it or not) would be from eternity forgiven their sins, and the prayer 'Forgive us our debts,' rest upon a misunderstanding. That Zinzendorf here and there betrays a tendency toward this Antinomian doctrine of restorationism (which in our day has found new dissemination in certain quarters through Erskine's book on "The Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel") is well known. Still one must not press his language too far, since in employing it he had glimpses of something most true and correct.

"From the principle which Zinzendorf asserts in the above quotation one might imagine that Wesley regarded faith as something in itself meritorious, after the fashion of the Remonstrant Grotius, for instance, or Menken, as a well-doing on the part of man, for the sake of which God does not regard his other sins, and which, in principle, as inner disposition of the man, already includes all good works. This, however, is not the case. Indeed, his whole life through, Wesley held fast to the doctrine that justification is nothing but the forgiveness of sins,* and he contradicted precisely the above cited assertion

* "Justificari est consequi remissionem peccatorum," says Melanchthon, in the Apology.

of Zinzendorf, that justification and regeneration are the same. He always taught that the two are inseparable, but that regeneration is the immediate effect and consequence of justification. The same representation is given by Richard Watson in his Theological Institutes, a work of high authority among the Methodists. He says, 'Faith is that qualifying condition to which the promise of God annexes justification; that without which justification would not take place; and in this sense it is that we are justified by faith; not by the merit of faith, but by faith instrumentally as this condition, for its connection with the benefit arises from the merits of Christ and the promise of God. If Christ had not merited, God had not promised, and justification had never followed upon this faith; so that the indissoluble connection of faith and justification is from God's institution, whereby he hath bound himself to give the benefit upon performance of the condition. Yet there is an aptitude in this faith to be made a condition, for no other act can receive Christ as a priest propitiating, and pleading the propitiation, and the promise of God for his sake to give the benefit. As receiving Christ and the gracious promise in this manner, it acknowledgeth man's guilt, and so man renounceth all righteousness in himself, and honoreth God the Father, and Christ the Son, the only Redeemer.'

"The antagonism between Wesley and the Moravian Brotherhood," continues the same writer, "referred, so far as it respected doctrine, to the relation between justification and sanctification, and to the doctrine of the imputation of the merits of Christ. While in the Moravian Society there grew up out of the feeling of vital communion with the Saviour the conception that the sinful soul is to view itself as every moment clothed, as it were, in the righteousness of Christ, and as represented by him before God, Wesley, though holding fast to the doctrine that forgiveness, or justification before God, is imparted to man on account of the satisfaction of Christ, and especially on account of his atoning death, nevertheless repudiates decidedly the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's active righteousness as unscriptural, maintaining that the believer continually needs, indeed, the forgiveness of sins or the confirmation of his justification, but that, in virtue of this new and ever renewed relationship to God, he must also in himself grow in holiness, and without this continual growth his supposed justification itself must rest on self-deception."

Besides this doctrinal antithesis between Wesley and the Moravians, there was a more general one with respect to the respective missions which Wesley and Zinzendorf proposed to

themselves. The latter desired simply to collect sinners, who had obtained mercy, into a Church; the former proposed to preach repentance to the unconverted and worldly-minded in the Church or out of it, wherever he could gain their ear. This divergence of aim is apparent in the above mentioned declaration of the Moravian Society in Marienborn, and to it Dr. Sack makes the following reference:

"Zinzendorf says expressly, 'We are no preachers of repentance for the world; by no means. Our proper business, that in which the Saviour seems to use and bless us, is to summon people, who know no other refuge, to the grace, the merits, the wounds of Jesus Christ, and then to give them counsel, and so far forth it may be said of us, *Sinunt mundum vadere sicut vadit.*' Wesley's yearning, aim, and effort, on the contrary, was from the beginning, in all places, through the preaching of the Gospel of free grace, proffered them in the merits of Christ, to call the lost, the wandering, the accursed to repentance; and to this end the application of the most universal instrumentalities, the presentation of a consistent and reasonable doctrine, the persistent assault of the hardest hearts, *debûts* in the noisy market-places of life, and finally a social unification and obligation to a common worship and moral discipline could but appear advisable, and in view of the exceeding diversity of individual tendencies of mind, and grades of culture, faith, and knowledge, even necessary. Zinzendorf collected around an already existing germ a community of believers, who were impelled to a morally pure cohabitation by an individually related feeling of love for the object of their faith. Wesley founded a society of confessors, who, prepared by a common religious experience, and for the sake of escaping the wrath to come, united themselves together to bear a pure testimony before each other, and before the world, and to walk with strictness in the commands of God."

With such diversities of doctrine and aim, a separation of the Methodists and Moravians was inevitable. Indeed, had it not occurred, Methodism could never have become such a blessing to the world. But that Wesley, in this separation, was prompted solely by the dictates of his conscience, and by no means by ambition or envy, must be apparent to every unprejudiced reader. And though Wesley, after the separation, decidedly opposed the errors into which the Moravian brethren had at that period fallen, and was himself rudely treated by

them, he, nevertheless, never forgot his obligations to them. The errors which had crept into the English Societies, and which were in part defended for a time by Count Zinzendorf, never obtained a controlling influence in the Moravian Church. In later years the sharpness of the antagonism wore off, and Wesley never ceased to cherish the most cordial feelings toward the Brotherhood, which feelings his followers have also inherited. God's all-over-watching providence has caused the division to redound to the good of his Church.

Art. VIII.—JOSEPHUS AND APION.

Flavius Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, was born at Jerusalem A.D. 37, in the first year of the reign of Caligula, and four years after the death of Christ. He was, by descent, a priest. His father Matthias belonged to the first of the twenty-four courses of priests. On his mother's side he was descended from the Asmonean princes—the Maccabees—who were also priests. He was proud of his lineage, often speaks of it with complacency, and complains of some who had called it in question.

The wealth and high position of his parents secured for him the best Jewish education. He acquired rapidly, and made such progress that at the age of fourteen he was often consulted by the Rabbins on abstruse points of the Jewish law. At the age of sixteen he began to study carefully the doctrines of the three leading Jewish sects, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and Essenes. Though a Pharisee by birth and education, he seems at this early period to have been inclined to the views of the Essenes; and hearing that Banus, a celebrated teacher of that sect, was living like a hermit in "the wilderness of Judea," using no other clothing than what grew on the trees, and no other food than what the sterile earth around him afforded, he went out and joined him, and continued under his instruction three years. Upon his return to Jerusalem he allied himself to the Pharisees, and was faithful to them ever afterward.

At the age of twenty-six he went to Rome to intercede for

some priests of his acquaintance whom Felix, the governor of Judea, had sent there for trial. He suffered shipwreck on his passage, and came very near losing his life. On landing at Puteoli, in the south of Italy, he gained the friendship of a famous play-actor, who was the favorite of Poppea, the wife of Nero. Through the good offices of this actor, and the intercession of Poppea, Josephus not only obtained the pardon of his friends, but received many valuable presents from the Empress.

On his return to Judea, Josephus found his countrymen bent, at all hazards, on throwing off the Roman yoke. Knowing, as he did, the vast resources of the Romans, and the hopelessness of engaging in a conflict with them, he did what he could to dissuade the Jews from the mad attempt. But his efforts were vain. They would not listen to him; and naught remained to him but to go into the struggle with his country and to share its fall.

To him was assigned, by the Jewish rulers, the responsibility of governing and defending Galilee. His appointment was opposed by a part of the Sanhedrim, particularly by John of Giscala, who intrigued against him, and even sought his life. But Josephus triumphed over him, went to his province, and so administered its affairs as to secure the confidence of the Galileans. He fortified the chief cities, trained the people to war, and repelled the first attack of the Romans. But this was only a temporary success. The Romans soon appeared in Palestine with a larger force, with Vespasian as their leader, and laid waste the country as they advanced. Hopeless of success, and abandoned by the authorities at Jerusalem, Josephus still tried to make head against them. He threw himself into the strong fortress of Jotapata, roused the people to a desperate resistance, and defended his position for forty-seven days. At the end of that time the place was stormed, and such of the garrison as had not perished in the siege were put to death. Josephus, with several others, fled to a cave, where they lay concealed for several days; but being betrayed by a woman he was dragged forth, and brought to Vespasian to receive sentence. At this critical moment Josephus solicited a private interview with Vespasian, when he told him of a dream which he had had in the cave. "I foretold long since," said he, "the result of this conflict with the Romans, and in vain

urged my countrymen to avoid it. And now it has been revealed to me, in the visions of the night, that the Emperor Nero will soon come to his end, and that Vespasian will occupy his place. Let me, then, be kept a prisoner until you shall obtain the imperial crown, and if it shall appear at any time that I have deceived you, let me then be put to death." Vespasian was won by the address of Josephus. He was kept a prisoner three years, was guarded with the greatest circumspection, but was kindly treated by Vespasian, and more especially by Titus, his son.

The death of Nero, which occurred very soon, was followed in Italy by bloody dissensions and civil wars. Several persons were proclaimed emperors, but were murdered almost as soon as proclaimed. In the midst of these commotions Vespasian was hailed emperor by his army in the East. In accepting the honor thus conferred upon him, he called to mind the prediction of Josephus that thus it should be, and sending for his prisoner he not only restored him to freedom, but conferred upon him peculiar favors.

These things took place at Alexandria, where Vespasian was stopping, that he might establish his authority in that important city. Upon his leaving for Rome, he ordered Titus to return into Judea, and finish the war which was raging there; and Titus persuaded Josephus to accompany him. Josephus remained with Titus until the close of the Jewish war, and was of special service to him on several occasions. He was sent by Titus more than once to entreat the Jews to submit to the Romans, and thus spare their beloved city and temple; but his entreaties were vain. The zealots and fanatics within the city would listen to no terms, being blinded as to the fate which awaited them.

It was while Josephus was here with Titus that he witnessed those awful portents which are described in his history of the Jewish wars, and by which our Saviour's predictions were so remarkably fulfilled. It was here that he saw the holy temple consumed, and the foundations of Zion plowed as a field.

When the war was ended, Titus offered to bestow upon Josephus any favor that he should ask. He simply asked the lives of some of his friends, and that the sacred books might be spared and given to him. He also received a valuable estate

in Judea, which he did not long tarry to enjoy; for when Titus left for Rome he took Josephus with him.

Arrived in Italy, he was received with high honor by the Emperor Vespasian. The freedom of the city was conferred upon him, an annual pension was granted him from the royal treasury, and he was permitted to occupy the same house in which the Emperor formerly lived.

Josephus was thrice married. His first wife was a captive, whom he espoused, at the instance of Vespasian, while he was himself a prisoner, but whom he afterward divorced. His second wife was a lady of Alexandria, whom, says he, "I forsook, because her manners did not please me, though she bare me three children." His third wife was a Jewess, of a noble Cypriote family, who seems to have been entirely agreeable to him, and by whom he had two sons.

The first work of Josephus was his "History of the Jewish Wars," written soon after the capture of Jerusalem and his arrival at Rome. It is divided into seven books, and details the history of the Jews from the destruction of their city by Antiochus Epiphanes, B. C. 170, until its subsequent destruction by Titus. The other great work of Josephus was his "Antiquities of the Jews," in twenty books, published about the year 93. Commencing with the creation of the world, it continues the history of the Jews and Israelites from the time of Abraham to the beginning of the war with Rome. Much of it is taken from the Old Testament; but on the main stem of the narrative many traditions have been grafted, chiefly with a view to honor his countrymen before the Romans, and refute the calumnies which were urged against them. His other works are an autobiography, and his two books against Apion. Of Apion's attack upon the "Antiquities," and of his reply, I am now to speak.

Although the Old Testament had been translated into Greek more than two hundred years before Josephus was born, it had not attracted much notice among the learned of other nations. Either they had not read it, or they regarded it as beneath their notice. But when Josephus, a man in high favor with the Emperor and the nobility of Rome, published in Greek the "Antiquities of the Jews," tracing their history back to the earliest ages—more than a thousand

years previous to the historic times of the Greeks—this proud and envious people were touched by it, and set themselves to refute it. The principal assailant of Josephus, and the only one to whom he makes a formal reply, was Apion.

Of Apion we know very little, and should have known less but for the notice taken of him by Josephus. He was a grammarian and teacher of rhetoric, born and educated at Alexandria, but a resident at Rome in the first century. The Emperor Tiberius used to call him *Cymbalum Mundi*, on account of his noisy loquacity and vanity.

He says that Moses brought the Israelites out of Egypt in the same year that Carthage was built by the Phenicians. But Josephus shows that Carthage was built one hundred and fifty years after the reign of Hiram, King of Tyre, the same that assisted Solomon in building the temple; and that the temple was not commenced until the four hundred and eightieth year after the exode from Egypt. Hence the exode occurred five hundred and thirty years earlier than the time fixed upon by Apion.

Apion gives the following ridiculous account of the origin of the Jewish Sabbath. "The children of Israel," he says, "were all of them infected with leprosy, and other cutaneous diseases, for which cause they were driven out of Egypt. They had swellings in the joints, so that it was with difficulty they could walk at all. Yet this diseased, maimed multitude managed to get through the wilderness into the land of Judah in six days, and celebrated the seventh as a rest or Sabbath!" And, as though this absurdity was not enough, Apion says in another place that the people rested forty days at the foot of Sinai, while Moses went up into the mount. Josephus shows up these absurdities with great zest, and indignantly repels the statement that the Israelites were lepers when they came out of Egypt, and were driven out because of their diseases.

Apion pretends that the Jews had in their temple the image of an ass's head, made of gold, and that this was discovered by Antiochus Epiphanes, who carried it away when he plundered the temple. "But if this story be true," asks Josephus, "why was not the image seen before? and why has it not been heard of since, until this ass of an Apion made the discovery?"

Apion further says that Antiochus found in the temple an imprisoned Greek, whom the Jews were pampering and fattening for sacrifice, and that he rescued the prisoner from their hands. To this Josephus replies that the best way to confute fools is to appeal to facts. And he goes on to show, from the very structure of the temple, and from its hallowed and guarded purity, that such a thing was strictly impossible.

Apion has another story about the Jews of the same character with those above related. It seems that the ass's head had been replaced after the time of Antiochus, and that an Idumean, whose name was Zabidus, had had the address to get into the temple and carry it away. "And say you so, sir!" replies Josephus. "Then does Apion make an ass of himself, and lays on him a burden of fooleries and lies. For he speaks of places which have no existence, and of things of which there is no history or tradition in the world, save his own."

Apion reproaches the Jews with their long and frequent subjection to the Gentile nations—the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans—and affirms that they have bound themselves, by an awful oath, to be perpetual enemies to all foreigners, and especially to the Greeks. Josephus replies that the Egyptians, of whom Apion was one, had been as long and as often in bondage as the Jews; and that the story of the oath was a sheer fabrication, contradicted by the whole history of the Jewish nation.

Apion insists that the Jews have never had any such wise men among them as Socrates, Plato, and Zeno; whereas Greece and Egypt abound with such men, among whom he is proud to enroll himself! A good illustration, this, of Tiberius's name for him, *Cymbalum Mundi*, to ring out his own vanity and applause.

Apion charges the Jews with "sacrificing animals, abstaining from swine's flesh, and practicing circumcision;" to which Josephus returns his favorite *argumentum ad hominem*, "The Egyptian priests are all circumcised, and abstain from swine's flesh, and offer animals in sacrifice to their gods."

But the principal objection of Apion and other Greek writers to Josephus's history was, that it ascribes too high an antiquity to the Jews. "It is incredible that their origin should be so remote, since no mention is made of them in Gre-

cian history until the time of Alexander." To this Josephus replies, first of all, that the Greeks have no reason to boast of their history, more especially of its antiquity, since it is of comparatively recent date. It is far exceeded, in this respect, by the histories of the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Phenicians, and of several other ancient nations. He next proceeds to confirm his statements as to the antiquity of the Jews by extracts from heathen authors. He quotes Manetho to show that "the Israelites came out of another country into Egypt, and went up out of Egypt more than a thousand years previous to the siege of Troy." He quotes from Berosus, the Chaldean, "a history of the deluge, and of the destruction of mankind; also of the preservation of Noah and his family in the ark, agreeing almost entirely with the narration of Moses." He quotes from Menander, the Tyrian, his account of the building of the temple at Jerusalem, one hundred and fifty years previous to the founding of Carthage. He quotes Aristotle's description of a people called Jews, "who took their name from Judea, the country they inhabit." He quotes Hecateus, describing the removal of a colony of Jews to Alexandria soon after it was built, and the favor that was shown to them by the first of the Ptolemies. He quotes Agitharchides, a later writer, who gives the following description of the Jews: "They dwell in a city called Jerusalem, and rest every seventh day, making no use of their arms, nor caring for any of the affairs of life; but they spread out their hands in their holy places, and continue their worship until the evening." In short, Josephus had no difficulty in vindicating the high antiquity of the Jews and the truth of his own statements on the subject, and that, too, by the testimony of heathen authors.

Certain Greeks had found fault with the *laws of Moses*, and made invidious comparisons between them and the statutes of their own lawgivers. This led Josephus to go into an exposition and defense of the Mosaic enactment; and this we deem the most interesting part of his controversy with Apion and the Greeks. "I have a mind," he says, "to discourse briefly about our whole constitution of government, and the particular branches of it. It will thence appear that our laws are disposed after the best manner for the advancement of piety, for social intercourse one with another, and for a general love

of mankind; also for justice, for sustaining trials with fortitude, and for contempt of death."

Josephus begins by saying that "our legislator is more ancient than any of whom we have knowledge. As for Lycurgus and Solon and Seleucus, so much admired among the Greeks, they are but of yesterday compared with ours." "Some legislators have placed their governments under monarchies, others under oligarchies, and others under a republican form; but our lawgiver had no regard to any of these forms. He ordained our government to be a *Theocracy*, by ascribing all power and authority to God. He taught us to regard him as the author of all good things, for which we are to pray to him and to return him our thanks. He showed us that we are ever naked and open to the eye of God; that we cannot escape his notice in our most secret actions, or even in our thoughts.

"Moses did not make religion to be a part of virtue, but he ordained the virtues to be parts of religion; since all our words and actions have reference to God." "Such, indeed, are our laws, that if any one had given out that he had written them himself, or had found them in some distant country, and had come and read them to the Greeks, I cannot doubt that all men would have admired them.

"As to the character of our laws there is no need of many words. They teach not impiety, but the truest piety in the world. They do not lead men to hate one another, but encourage all acts of kindness and liberality. They enjoin righteousness and justice. They banish idleness and luxurious living. They teach men to be laborious in their callings, and to be content with what they have. They forbid aggressive wars, but make men courageous in defending the right. They are inexorable in punishing malefactors, and are established more by actions than by the sophistry of words."

But however eloquently Josephus may discourse respecting the laws of Moses, his own character did not conform entirely to them. He was a vain, ambitious man, fond of popularity, and ever seeking for it by flattering the Romans and consulting their wishes. There is too much evidence that his histories are colored, and even modified, by this dangerous partiality.

As a writer, Josephus possesses many valuable qualities.

His diction is for the most part classical, and his narrative is so clear and vigorous as to have earned for him the title of the Greek Livy. He claims for himself the merit of entire faithfulness; but this must be conceded to him with some abatements. In narrating the facts of the Old Testament, to use the language of Echard, "he sometimes gives them such an artificial turn, and uses such disguising and mollifying strokes, as shows that he dares not follow the truth rigidly, but prefers to accommodate the most surprising passages to the humors and opinions of those for whom he wrote." Yet after all these imperfections, his Antiquities must be acknowledged to be a noble work, and was highly advantageous to the better sort of Gentiles, who might be induced to read this when they despised the Old Testament.

On several accounts the works of Josephus have ever been, and still are, of service to the Christian world. They help to vindicate, as we have seen, the antiquity of the Old Testament, the authenticity of its books, and the truth of its statements, even those which relate to miracles. In the first century after Christ, infidels had not learned to doubt the truth of miracles. Their own writings were full of them, to be accounted for either by magical arts or by the interposition of the heathen gods.

Josephus is also a help to us in settling the canon of the Old Testament. He gives us the number and a description of the books, and they are found to agree with our own. "We have not," he says, "an innumerable multitude of books, as the Greeks have, disagreeing and contradicting one another; but we have only twenty-two books, which are justly believed to be divine. Of these, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. In the interval of time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, King of Persia, the prophets wrote down what was done in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life."*

The Rabbins, in the time of Josephus, had limited the number of their sacred books to twenty-two, that they might coincide with the number of Hebrew letters. To effect the necessary reduction they had joined together several of the

* Works, vol. vi, p. 173.

books, as Judges and Ruth, Ezra and Nehemiah, Jeremiah and the Lamentations, and all the minor prophets.

Josephus is also a help to us in interpreting many passages of the Old Testament. He introduces circumstances which throw light upon particular passages, removing difficulties, and harmonizing apparent discrepancies. His paraphrase of the sacred history is, in many parts of it, of the nature of a commentary, not to be followed implicitly, but to be consulted, in interpreting the Old Testament.

Josephus is of essential service to Christians in that he bears testimony to some of the leading facts of the Gospel history. He speaks expressly of Herod's murder of John the Baptist, that he might make way for Herodias. Herod had repudiated his former wife, who was the daughter of Aretas, a king of Arabia. To avenge the ill-treatment of his daughter, Aretas made war upon Herod, conquered him, and destroyed his army. Referring to these events Josephus says: "Some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army was from God, and that very justly, as a punishment for what he did to John the Baptist; for Herod slew him, who was a very good man." †

Josephus also refers to the murder of the Apostle James, and thinks that the destruction of Jerusalem was a judgment upon the Jews for their guilt in this matter. "These miseries," he says, "befell the Jews by way of revenge for James the Just, who was the brother of Jesus, that was called Christ; because they had slain him, who was a most righteous person." *

The genuineness of these passages is not disputed. There is another which has been questioned, in which Josephus speaks directly of Christ. "About this time lived Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he performed wonderful works, and was a teacher of those who had a veneration for the truth. He drew over to him many, both of the Jews and also of the Gentiles. He was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him. For he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the Divine Prophets had spoken; whence the

* Antiq., Book xviii. † Antiq., Book xx.

tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day." *

The principal objection to this passage is, that the writer calls Jesus *the Christ;* implying that Josephus was a Christian. But we do not so understand the declaration. What Josephus meant to say was, that Jesus was frequently called the Christ —was believed to be the Christ by his followers. And so the passage is quoted by Jerome: "He was believed to be the Christ." The passage may have been written originally as Jerome quotes it. But as it stands in our editions of Josephus, it no more implies that *he* believed Jesus to be the Christ. than Pilate's superscription on the cross implies that he regarded Jesus of Nazareth as the proper King of the Jews. This passage of Josephus comes in very naturally where it stands; it is quoted as genuine by most of the early fathers, and we feel inclined to admit its authenticity. And if it be authentic, it is certainly a very important testimony from a learned and almost contemporaneous Jew, to the fact of his having lived at that time, and to some of the leading events of his history.

As Christians, we are also indebted to Josephus for recording a most remarkable fulfillment of prophecy—we mean our Saviour's prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem. We need not go into an exposition of this matter. Let any one read our Saviour's prediction, as recorded in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, and then read Book VI of Josephus's History of the Wars of the Jews, and see if he can retain a lingering doubt that here was a most remarkable prediction most remarkably and circumstantially fulfilled. The Jews and Romans had no knowledge of this prediction, and could have had no intention of fulfilling it. Nor could Josephus have had any intention of recording its fulfillment when he wrote his history. And yet here it is—the event harmonizing with the prophecy exactly—sufficient of itself, if we had no other evidence, to prove the divinity of our Saviour's person, and of his mission to the world.

On the whole, we have much reason to be thankful that God raised up such a man as Josephus at the eventful period in which he lived; that he put it into his heart to write his histories; and that these have come down to us in a shape so

* Antiq., Book xviii.

authentic and satisfactory. Let Christian scholars make themselves acquainted with these histories, and faithfully use them to the glory of God, and for the explication, vindication, and furtherance of his Gospel.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

The Roman Council — Important Movement within the Roman Catholic Church.—The Council in Rome has been in session since the 8th of December, 1869; but in consequence of the oath of secresy which all the participants have to take not to divulge any part of the proceedings, our knowledge of its history is but fragmentary and uncertain. To the great mortification of the Roman authorities, it has, however, been found impossible to prevent the publication of the important documents which have been laid before the Council; and even accounts, generally regarded as trustworthy, of some of the most important speeches made by the Bishops, have found their way into publicity.

Thus we are tolerably well informed about the progress of the question of Papal infallibility, which is by far the most important topic that awaits the decision of the Council. Three parties, it seems, have been formed among the Bishops with regard to this question: one which regards the promulgation of this new doctrine as the best and most urgent work the Council should attend to; the second, which petitions the Pope against this doctrine, which they believe would be at least a great stumbling-block for all non-Catholics, and even for a great many members of the Catholic Church; the third, which is in favor of a compromise, would have some regard for the arguments adduced by the second class, and therefore, instead of promulgating in unmistakable and bold clearness the doctrine of Papal infallibility, would attain the same end in a less offensive way, by inculcating the duty of an absolute submission to every decision of the Pope in matters of faith. The majority of the Bishops are reported to have signed a petition for the promulgation of infallibility. Altogether this petition, which has been drawn up by the German Bishop of Paderborn, is said to have received 410 signatures. The counter-address (or rather counter-addresses) against the infallibility was signed by 162 Bishops, among whom were 20 Americans, 46 Frenchmen, 37 Germans and Austrians, 19 Orientals, 2 Portuguese, 14 Hungarians, 3 Englishmen, and 15 Italians. The address of the middle party, which desires to effect a compromise, is said to have been drawn up by the Archbishop of Baltimore. Other addresses are mentioned, but they coincide more or less with one of these three. The reports on the debates, of course, widely differ; but the addresses of the three parties, which have been published, are, on all sides, accepted as authentic. The address against the proclamation of the doctrine of infallibility has been drawn up by the Cardinal Archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna. It is couched in the most submissive expressions, assures the Holy Father of the devotedness of all the Bishops to the Apostolical See, and continues: "It would not be right to ignore that many difficulties, arising from expressions or actions of the Church fathers from the documents of history, and even from the Catholic doctrine, remain, which must be thoroughly explained before it would be admissible to lay this doctrine before the Christian people as one revealed by God. But our minds revolt against a controversial discussion of this question, and confidently implore thy kindness not to lay upon us the duty of such a transaction. As we, moreover, exercise the Episcopal functions among great Catholic nations, we know their condition from daily intercourse; hence we are satisfied that the asked-for doctrinal decision will offer weapons to the enemies of religion, in order to excite aversion to the Catholic religion, even of men of good character, and we are certain that this decision would offer, at least in Europe, an opportunity or a pretext to the governments of our countries to make encroachments upon the rights which have remained to

the Church. We have concluded to lay this before thy Holiness, with the sincerity which we owe to the Father of the Faithful, and we ask thee that the doctrinal opinion, the sanction of which is demanded by the address, be not submitted to the Council for consideration." Among the signers are, besides the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna, nearly all the Archbishops of Germany and Austria; in particular, the Cardinal Archbishop of Prague, the Archbishops of Cologne, Munich, Bamberg, and others.

The Bishops who have signed this remonstrance against the promulgation of Papal infallibility as a doctrine, confine themselves to urging the inopportuneness. Only a very few have, thus far, plainly expressed themselves against the dogma itself. But what the Bishops have failed to do, the Catholic scholars, especially those of Germany, have done so emphatically, that their protests against the ultra Papal theories, and against the whole spirit prevailing in Rome, has made a profound sensation throughout the Christian world. We have already (in the preceding number of the Methodist Quarterly Review) referred to the important work on "The Pope and the Council," whose author, on the title-page, calls himself "Janus." Though the origin of the book is not yet fully cleared up, it is now generally supposed that the celebrated Church historian, Dr. Döllinger, must have aided in the compilation, for the book furnishes proof of so vast an amount of historical learning, as, besides Dr. Döllinger, but few Catholic scholars are believed to possess. But whatever share Döllinger may have had in the compilation of this work, he has not hesitated to show his face, and has, in a letter addressed to the "Gazette of Augsburg," subjected the address of those Bishops who ask for the promulgation of the Papal infallibility to such a crushing criticism, that it would seem impossible for any one who shares the sentiments expressed in his article, ever to accept Papal infallibility, whether it be declared a dogma by the Council or not.

Dr. Döllinger says of this petition of the champions of Papal infallibility, that henceforth "one hundred and eighty millions of human beings are to be forced, on pain of excommunication, refusal of the sacraments, and everlasting damnation, to believe and to profess that which hitherto the Church has *not* believed, *not* taught." The proclamation of this dogma, he says, would be an "alteration in the faith and doctrine of the Church, such as *has never been heard of since Christianity was first founded.*" The whole foundation of the Church would thereby be affected. Dr. Döllinger shows conclusively that until the sixteenth century the doctrine of Papal infallibility was entirely unknown, and that when it was taken up by Cardinal Bellarmine, it could only be supported by the testimony of Isidorian decretals, which are *forged*, and those of Cyril, which are a *fiction*.

What makes the declaration of Dr. Döllinger particularly important is the fact that all the leading Roman Catholic scholars of Germany openly confess their entire concurrence with his views. Thus the professors of the Universities and theological faculties of Bonn, Breslau, Prague, Münster, Braunsberg, have signed addresses to Döllinger, assuring him of their full concurrence in his views, and thanking him for the manly words he has spoken. Not a single scholar of reputation is thus far found on the Papal side. The papers of Germany are filled with the declarations of professors of the universities and colleges, and of many of the prominent laymen who have spent their whole lives in the defense of the Roman Catholic interests, thanking Dr. Döllinger for his very timely and manly utterances. Even the German Bishops, yea, the German Cardinals, more or less sympathize with the same views, and have signed protests against at least some of the proceedings of the Council. Roman Catholic papers report that a meeting of the German and Austrian Bishops has been held in Rome, at which two of the Bishops who signed the address against infallibility proposed to censure the letter of Dr. Döllinger as too severe in its language, but that they were voted down, most of the Bishops, especially the learned Dr. Hefele, the new Bishop of Rottenburg, formerly Professor of Church History at the University of Tübingen, and author of the best work on the history of the Councils, expressing entire approbation of all the sentiments uttered by Dr. Döllinger. Thus it may be said that the Roman Catholics of Germany are once more in full revolt against the spirit that prevails in Rome.

Even stronger than the declaration of Dr. Döllinger is a protest from Father

Gratry, a French priest, one of the first theological scholars of France, and a member of the French Academy. In a reply to the Archbishop of Mechlin in Belgium, who has written a book in favor of infallibility, he shows that the sixth Œcumenical Council really condemned Pope Honorius as a heretic; that for centuries "the school of dissimulation, craft, and lies has labored to stifle the true history of Pope Honorius;" that to this end the Roman Breviary has been designedly falsified; that "never was there perpetrated in history a more audacious piece of knavery." But lies, he concludes, will not profit God, the Church, or the Papacy.

The papal party has become aware of the danger which threatens the Church from the indignant protests of the Catholic scholars. As they have no scholars who can compare with men like Döllinger, they try to make up for the lack of intelligence by the fierceness of their denunciations. They call Döllinger an apostate, a Judas, even an Antichrist. Blinded by their madness, they sometimes fall into amusing blunders. Thus a Roman Catholic paper of this country, which is edited by some fanatical partisan of the infallibilists, regards the address of the 140 Bishops against the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility as a forgery. Every sentence of this address, it says, clearly shows this. It then quotes a few sentences from the address, and adds: "Such words only enemies of the Church can put in the mouth of the Bishops, and proclaim as a truth, in order to make the world believe, in case the doctrine of the infallibility, which, from the times of the Apostles, has always been believed in the Church, should really be declared to be a dogma, that the consent of the Bishops has been obtained by compulsion." Now, this address, which is here denounced as an evident forgery, has since been officially recognized as authentic in a declaration of one of its signers, the Archbishop of Cologne, who denounces the letter of Dr. Döllinger as going too far, and regrets the publication of the address which he signed, but admits its authenticity, and his concurrence with its views. This fact is a significant commentary on the boasted unity of the Church of Rome, and on the intelligence of its members.

Among the correspondences which all the leading papers of the world now regularly bring from Rome, those of the *Augsburg Gazette* (*Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*) have given more information than any others. To the dismay of Rome, which has compelled the Bishops to take an oath to preserve complete secrecy, the *Augsburg Gazette* has published all the addresses signed by the different parties of the Council, the draft of the important decrees, as well as full accounts of the most important speeches. How all this information has been obtained is still a mystery. The Roman government has expelled several priests from Rome who were suspected of being the authors of the hated correspondences; but the editors of the *Augsburg Gazette* declare upon their word of honor that the persons expelled are entirely foreign to their Roman letters; and that whatever the Council may decree on the infallibility question, the papal government has shown itself very fallible in the discovery of the genuine correspondent of the *Augsburg Gazette*. Even papers like the *Univers* of Paris, state that a man succeeded in obtaining admission to several sessions of the Council, disguised as an Oriental Bishop, before he was discovered.

According to the correspondences of the *Augsburg Gazette*, the papal pillars of the Council are the Cardinals de Angelos, de Luca, Bilio, and Capalti. They all agree in feeling the most profound abhorrence of "German science," which they regard as the greatest danger to the Church, and as something which must be put down at any cost. Only one of these, Bilio, who is a Barnabite monk, has the reputation of being a scholar; the others lay no claim to any amount of theological learning. Among the Italian bishops there is hardly any one who plays a prominent part in either party. Even all the leaders of the infallibilist party are foreigners. Among them are specially mentioned, Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore; Archbishop Manning, of Westminster; Archbishop Dechamps, (a member of the order of Redemptorists,) of Malines in Belgium; Bishop Martin, of Paderborn, Germany; Bishop Pie, of Poictiers, France; Bishop Mermillod, of Geneva. Prominent on the other side are the three German Cardinals, Prince Schwarzenberg, Rauscher, and Hohenlohe; the French Cardinal Mathieu; Archbishop Darboy, of Paris; Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans; the learned Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg; Bishop Strossmayer, and Archbishop Haynald, of Hungary; Bishop Moriarty

of Ireland; Bishop Brown, of England. The most effective speech on this side is said to have been made by Bishop Strossmayer, who demanded that the rights of the Bishops be extended, and that a General Council be called every tenth year. These views have, in particular, been supported by Cardinal Schwarzenberg and Primate Simor, of Hungary

PROTESTANTISM.

THE BROAD CHURCH PARTY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—The Church of England does not find it as easy as many, both High and Low Church, had hoped, to get rid of the Broad Church or "Liberal" and "Rationalistic" elements. Even the case of Dr. Colenso remained, at the close of the year, in an unsettled condition. The Bishop of Cape Town, a resolute High Churchman and Ritualist, has consecrated a new Bishop (Macrorie, also a High Churchman) for the diocese of Colenso, and this act has been fully approved by all the other Bishops of South Africa, who do no longer recognize Bishop Colenso, but hold communion with his successor; but the English Government has expressly declared, that, in the eyes of the law, Colenso continues to be the regular Bishop. In England, the Broad Church controversy has been violently renewed by the appointment of one of the seven authors of the celebrated "Essays and Reviews," Dr. Temple, as Bishop of Exeter. The High and Low Church party were equally surprised and mortified at the appointment; a joint opposition was at first thought of, but soon given up. A part of the chapter, chiefly High Churchmen, mustered courage to declare concurrence in the election commanded by the Government, and when the majority elected Dr. Temple, entered a protest against the election. A majority of the Bishops likewise expressed either dissatisfaction with, or, at least, regret at the election. Still the Government carried its point, and Dr. Temple has become a member of the Episcopal bench. Strong efforts were then made to prevail upon the new Bishop to repudiate his contribution to the "Essays and Reviews;" but though the new Bishop appears to be willing to act now with greater reserve, he has as yet shown no sign of an intention to separate from the party with which he had heretofore acted in union.

ART. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The well-known Wolfgang Menzel has published a large work on the Antechristian Doctrines of Immortality (*Die Vorchristlichen Unsterblichkeitslehren. Leipz.* 1869. 2 vols. The author says that this work was begun more than thirty years ago, and he claims to have found many new results, especially as regards the opinion of the ancient Germans, with regard to immortality.

Among the numerous works which appear annually on the history of the Jesuits, one by Dr. Zirngible, author of an excellent life of Dr. H. Jacobi, deserves a special mention. It treats, in particular, of the history of the Jesuit schools in Germany. (*Studien über das Institut der Gesellschaft Jesus.* Leipz. 1869.)

Dr. Pichler, formerly Professor of Catholic Theology at the University of Munich, at present Librarian in St. Petersburg, has published a work on the Real Obstacles to, and the Fundamental Condition of, a Thorough Reform of the Catholic Church, especially in Germany, (*Die wahren Hindernisse und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgreifenden Reform der Kathol. Kirche zu nächst in Deutschland.* Leipz. 1870.) The author, who has written the best history of the division of the Latin and Greek Churches, and several other learned works on Church history, all of which have been put on the Roman Index, shows in this new work the utter rottenness of the Church of Rome. Like a number of Roman Catholic writers, he thinks that apostolic Christianity has been preserved much better

among the Oriental Churches than by Rome.

One of the most important works of recent Roman Catholic literature, the "Life of Photius," by Professor Hergenröther, of the University of Wurzburg, has been completed by the publication of the third volume. (*Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel.* Ratisbon, 1869.) The third volume contains three sections: 1. The writings of Photius; 2. His theology; 3. The progress of the Greek schism. The author treats the whole subject from a strictly Roman Catholic stand-point; he recognizes, however, the literary merits of Photius. In the last section the author carries the ecclesiastical controversy between the eastern and western Churches to the end of the thirteenth century. He announces that he is likely to treat in future of the efforts to reunite the two Churches.

Professor Hergenröther had promised to publish, as an appendix to the third volume, several inedited works of Photius; but he has since changed his intention, and published these works in a separate work, entitled *Monumenta Græca ad Photium ejusque historiam spectantia.* (Ratisbon, 1869.) These works, to each of which a Latin translation is added, are partly, without doubt, from Photius; partly their Photian origin is doubtful, and partly they are surely from others. The publication of other works of prominent authors of the Greek Church is promised.

Germany has produced during the last two years a very extensive literature on the death penalty, called forth by the discussion of the subject in the Legislative Assemblies. Public opinion declares overwhelmingly against the penalty. From a theological point of view, one of the six "prelates" of the Lutheran Church of Wurtemberg, Mehring, has been for years a very earnest opponent of the death penalty, and a pamphlet published by him on the subject (*Die Frage von der Todesstrafe*, second edition, 1869) has made a profound impression. Another theological opponent of this penalty is H. Hetzel, who has written a very elaborate work against it, (*Die Todesstrafe in Ihrer culturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Berlin, 1870,) in tracing its history among all the civilized nations from the earliest times to the present day, and reviewing all the arguments which at any time have been brought forward for or against it. A physician, Dr. Schaible, likewise an earnest opponent, treats of the subject with special reference to England, (*Ueber die Todes und Freiheitsstrafe.* Berlin, 1869.) From the stand-point of law, the penalty is attacked in the work of Loos, Town Counselor at Berlin, on the impossibility to prove the penalty of death. (*Die Unmöglichkeit einer Begründung der Todesstrafe.* Berlin, 1870.) On the other hand, the death penalty has found a number of new defenders, among whom are Pastor A. Fürer, (*Die Todesstrafe*, Schönebeck, 1869; an essay first read at the Lutheran Conference of Gnadau, and accompanied with an opinion of President von Gerlach, for many years one of the leaders of the conservative party,) Professor Dr. Wuttke, well known as a prominent theological writer, (in an article published in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*,) and Dr. Kuntze, Professor of Law. (*Ueber die Todesstrafe*, Leipsic, 1868.)

The Roman Catholics are fond of bragging of the large number of distinguished persons who, since the beginning of the Reformation, have joined their communion. A considerable number of works have been written on the subject, the largest one of which is from Dr. Räss, Bishop of Strasburg. A Protestant professor of Heidelberg, Dr. Nippold, has examined these transitions in a book entitled "Which Ways lead to Rome?" (*Welche Wege führen nach Rom?* Heidelberg, 1869.) The work is written from a Rationalistic stand-point.

An able work on the Mormons has been published by Dr. Moriz Busch, (*Geschichte der Mormonen*, Leipsic, 1870.)

Art. XI.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Presbyterian Review, January, 1870. (New York.) 1. What is it to Think? 2. Sin and Suffering in the Universe. 3. The Meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York. 4. Inspiration and the Historic Element in the Scriptures. 5. Biblical Theology, with Especial Reference to the New Testament. 6. The Development of Doctrine. 7. Solomon's Song.

Baptist Quarterly, January, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Christ's Exaltation and Second Coming. 2. Spectrum Analysis. 3. Conception of Christ and Christianity in "Ecce Homo." 4. The New Dominion. 5. Baptism in the Greek Church. 6. The True Method of Preaching.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, January, 1870. (New York.)—1. The History and Literature of Civil Service Reform. 2. The Early Regeneration of Sabbath-school Children. 3. The Life of Samuel Miller, D. D., LL. D. 4. A Fragment. What the Greeks thought of the Religion of the Jews. 5. The Reign of Law. 6. Adjourned Meetings of the General Assemblies at Pittsburgh. 7. The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D. 8. The Presbyterian Church—Its Position and Work.

Christian Quarterly, January, 1870. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Creed Question. 2. Christian Apologetics—Strauss and Renan. 3. The Newspaper and Periodical Press. 4. The Papacy and Civil Government. 5. Saul of Tarsus and Paul the Apostle. 6. The Eyes of the "World."

Evangelical Quarterly Review, January, 1870. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Importance and Connection of Works and Faith. 2. The Influence of Revivals on the State of Religion. 3. Reminiscences of Lutheran Ministers. 4. Piety and Property. 5. The Greatness of being Useful. 6. The Chinese Problem. 7. The Ascensions of Christ. 8. The Question of Close Communion. 9. Christ's Prophecy of his Sufferings. 10. The Total Eclipse of the Sun of 1869.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, October, 1869. (Dover.) 1. Sketches of Life and Labor in India. 2. Special Providence and Free Moral Agency not Incompatible. 3. The Disestablishment of the Irish Church. 4. Lessons from the Temptations of Christ. 5. The Religious Condition of France, from the Revolution of 1789 to the Present Time. 6. The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry. 7. The Renaissance and the Reformation.

Mercersburg Review, January, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Dr. Ebrard, and his Position on the Church Question. 2. The Intermediate State. 3. Authority and Freedom. 4. Anthropological Statistics. 5. Progressive Conservatism. 6. Once for All. 7. The Pericopes, or Selections of Gospels and Epistles for the Church Year. 8. The Bible in the Common Schools. 9. The General Synod.

New Englander, January, 1870. (New Haven.)—1. The Chinese Migration. 2. The Life of a Jesuit Father of Our Own Day—Father De Ravignan. 3. Father Hyacinthe. 4. Review of the Life of Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander. 5. Moral Results of the Romish System. 6. James Russell Lowell and Robert Browning.

North American Review, January, 1870. (Boston.)—1. The Let-alone Principle. 2. Indian Migrations. 3. An Ancient Creed. 4. Railway Problems in 1869. 5. The Ecclesiastical Crisis in England. 6. The Treasury Reports.

Theological Medium. January, 1870. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. The Necessity of a Knowledge of Ecclesiastical History to Young Men preparing for the Ministry. 2. The Atonement. 3. Preparation for the Pulpit. 4. Infant Salvation. 5. Power in the Pulpit. 6. A Right View of the Church is Necessary to a Right View of the Ministry—The Life of the One is Maintained by the Life of the Other. 7. Woman's Work in the Church. 8. The Bible in the Public Schools.

Universalist Quarterly, January, 1870. (Boston.)—1. Africa: Physical, Historical, and Ethnological. 2. Primeval Man. 3. The Nature and Character of Christ. 4. Life and Death Eternal. 5. Recent German Literature. 6. The Spirit of the Monks. 7. The Moravians.

Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1870. (Andover.)—1. The Incarnation. 2. Revelation and Inspiration. 3. The Human Intellect. 4. The Progress of Truth Dependent on Correct Interpretation. 5. Bethesda and its Miracle. 6. The Doctrine of the Apostles. 7. Recent Theories on the Origin of Language. 8. New Studies in Egyptology. 9. Assyrian Studies—Text-Books. 10. The Topography of Jerusalem.

The first article by Professor Reubelt is learned and able. It is written in favor of what is called the *Kenosis;* that is, as we understand it, the doctrine that, dichotomically speaking, *the second person of the Trinity reduced itself to human dimensions and became the soul of Jesus.* The soul of Christ was the Logos diminished down to humanity. We are not disposed to dogmatize on such a subject. We must speak with respect of a dogma held by Dorner, Pressensé, and by Dr. Nast. But as the doctrine must necessarily be that the Logos became truly and intrinsically a *human soul*, (otherwise Christ was not a perfect *man*,) it seems to follow that during the period of the hypostatic union there is no divine Logos, and there is no Trinity; only a *dunity.* To the discussion of this view the Professor would forbid our coming with "preconceived notions." But, we reply, we necessarily come to all subjects, not blank and idiotic, but with some previous prepossessions. And when we are told that the Infinite can become finite, can annihilate an infinity of power, and so can annihilate Himself, we beg to be excused from surrendering all our previous views of the necessary existence of God, and approaching the awful confines of Atheism. Surrender the doctrine of the necessary existence of God, and you surrender one stronghold of Theism. God exists in the fullness of his necessary omnipotence, omnipresence, and eternity. These attributes he may vail, may withhold their display in specific acts; but how can he abdicate or diminish their existence?

The Professor's first proof-text is, *The Word became flesh;* which he transforms into *The Word became man.* Thereupon he insists that these words affirm that the eternal Logos ceased to be God and commenced to be man! But if ἐγένετο is to receive so literal a rendering, we must literalize σὰρξ also; and then we shall have it that the eternal Logos ceased to be God and became a portion of fleshly matter. The Professor's argument from Mark xiii, 32, we think, he will find amply answered in our commentary on the passage.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1870. (London.)—1. The Jewish Synagogue. 2. The Distinctive Character of Old Testament Scripture. 3. Life of Sir William Hamilton. 4. Laics in Theology—1. Matthew Arnold. 5. "As Regards Protoplasm." 6. A Chapter on France. 7. Union of Church and State. 8. Female Catholic Life in France. 9. Principal Candlish's Introductory Lecture.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1870. (London.)—1. The Irish Land Question. 2. Lord Lytton's Horace. 3. Revision of the English Bible. 4. The Free Church of Scotland. 5. National Education—The Union *vs.* The League. 6. Œcumenical Councils. 7. Mr. Tennyson's New Poems.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1870. (London.)—1. Denominational and National Education. 2. The Diary of Henry Crabb Robinson. 3. Morris's Poetry. 4. The Greco-Russian Church. 5. Reconstruction of the Irish Church. 6. Ultramontanism. 7. Egypt and the Suez Canal. 8. Sainte-Beuve and Renan.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, January, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Babylonian and Assyrian Libraries. 2. Swift. 3. Origin of American State Rights. 4. Autobiographies. 5. Decentralization in France and Prussia. 6. History of Irish Land Tenures. 7. Repentance of the Tory Party.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Our Colonial Empire. 2. Land Tenures and their Consequences. 3. The Subjection of Women. 4. The Irish Land Question. 5. Prostitution: Governmental Experiments in Controlling it. 6. Our Policy in China. 7. American Claims on England.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street, N. Y.)—1. Mr. Froude's History of Queen Elizabeth. 2. Geological Theory in Britain. 3. Memoirs of General von Brandt. 4. Sir Charles Adderley on Colonial Policy. 5. John Calvin in Church and State. 6. London Topography and Street-nomenclature. 7. Veitch's Memoir of Sir William Hamilton. 8. The Prechristian Cross. 9. The Irish Land Question.

Touching the destiny of earth and sun, the second article has the following passage:

It is absolutely certain that all planetary matter is inevitably gravitating toward the sun, which will be the common bourne of our system. "As surely," eloquently writes Sir William Thomson, "as the weights of a clock run down to their lowest position, from which they can never rise again unless fresh energy is communicated to them from some source not yet exhausted, so surely must planet after planet creep in, age by age, toward the sun;" not one can escape its fiery end. In like manner the satellites of the planets must inevitably fall into their respective planets.

As, then, it has been proved by geology that our earth had a fiery beginning, so it is shown, by an appeal to the law of gravitation, that it will have a fiery end.... The earth passed from the incandescent into the habitable state, and will have its individuality annihilated by falling into the sun, and the same fate will ultimately overtake the sun if it be true that it also is revolving round some enormously distant center of attraction.

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) 1870. Second Number. *Essays:* 1. BEYSCHLAG, The "Vision Theory" and its most Recent Defenses 2. WIESELER, The Fourth Book of Ezra Examined with Regard to its Content and Age. 3. Christianity and Civilization. *Thought and Remarks:* 1. SACK, A Few Passages on the Fear of the Lord. *Reviews:* CASPARY, Chronological-Geographical Introduction to the Life of Jesus Christ, reviewed by ROSCH.

The first article concludes the important defense of the reality of the resurrection of Christ, against the work of Dr. Holsten,

which, on all sides, is admitted to be the ablest work against it on the side of the Rationalists.

In the second article, Professor Karl Wieseler, one of the most learned exegetical writers of Germany, enters into a learned investigation of the age and the contents of the apocryphal Fourth Book of Ezra, one of the most important Jewish writings of the time of Christ. This work has of late become a favorite object of exegetical research. Ewald has published the Arabic text, with various readings, of the Ethiopic translation, (*Das 4te, Ezrabuch*, 1863;) Volkmar, a new edition of the Latin text, (*Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apocryphen*, second edition, 1863;) Ceriani, the Syriac text, with a Latin translation, (*Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus præsertim biblioth. Ambrosianæ*, 1861–1868,) and Hilgenfeld, a Latin translation of the Armenian text, by Petermann, (*Messias Judæorum*, 1869.) The opinions of the scholars about the origin of the book still vary from the time of Cæsar to that of Domitian. Wieseler endeavors to confirm the opinion expressed by him in a former writing, that it was compiled under the Emperor Domitian.

Zeitschrift fur Historische Theologie. (Journal for Historical Theology.) 1870. Second Number. 1. Nobbe, Life of Dr. Hieronymus Weller. 2. Schurer, The Easter Controversy of the Second Century. 3. Cassiodori Reinii Epistolæ tredecim ad Matthiam Ritterum datæ. 4. Letter of Charles V. to the King of Poland, written by A. Valdes.

Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie. (Journal of Scientific Theology, edited by Professor Hilgenfeld.) 1870. Second Number. 1. Werner, Conscience, an Ethical Essay. 2. Hilgenfeld, New Works on the Gospels. 3. Pfleiderer, The Evangelical Narrative on the Temptation of Jesus. 4. Noldeke, Further Remarks on the Unhistoric Character of Genesis xlv. 5. Spiegel, Some Remarks on the Family Jerusalem.

Art. XII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Rome and Italy at the Opening of the Œcumenical Council. Depicted in Twelve Letters Written from Rome to a Gentleman in America. By Edmond De Pressensé, Pastor of the Evangelical Church in Paris. Translated by Rev. George Prentice, A. M. 12mo., pp. 327. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The "Gentleman in America" is any American who is wise enough to buy and read the book. The "Letters" were received from Rome in the author's autograph by Carlton & Lanahan, and

printed as fast as received. They are fresh, therefore, from Rome, and fresh from De Pressensé.

Of Pressensé the "North British Review" says, "His sentences are like cut crystal." In his Mystery of Suffering, the "Foreign Evangelical Review" finds "the same intellectual power, the same exquisite felicity of diction, the same sustained and dignified eloquence, and the same persuasive, invigorating Christian thought which are conspicuous in his Life of Christ." Pages of similar eulogy might be quoted from the foreign periodicals. His glowing classic eloquence, his expansive mental clearness, his lofty assertion of the principles of both faith and freedom, are winning him a high place in the heart of Protestant Christendom. His theology is Melanchthonian, varying a shade from the views of Wesley, while in minor details he exercises a free individualism on points in which we differ from him, but with no vital difference.

In the present work he gives free range to his powers. He expatiates over the scenes of natural beauty which wonderful Italy spreads before his eye. He lingers in delighted yet critical enthusiasm among her multitudinous works of art. He walks the Roman streets and paints the monuments of the past and movements of the living present. He descends into those wonders of subterranean Rome, the Catacombs, where lie the nations of the dead in one vast monumental city, cut by nine hundred miles of streets, and where the epitaphs of a whole glorious army of martyrs reveal to us the wonders and glories of the early faith. In the great pivotal questions of the age he is at home. He understands their genesis from the history of Europe. His penetrative eye reads Papal Rome through and through. His prescient eye sees hope only in the far future; a period of blessed sunshine after Europe has tried the awful experiment of utter Godlessness. Even while the Council was commencing its sessions at Rome a convention of Atheists were assembling at Naples. Dismal was its failure; but in the great current of public thought Pressensé recognizes a growing rejection of God, for which nothing but a temporary but complete success can be the remedy. Evangelical Protestantism tries its hand in vain. The listless ear of Italy will not listen. O for a mighty Savonarola, a divinely anointed missionary, bearing down all opposition by the power of the spirit that is in him, and rearing the standard of the holy Evangels to rescue this fair land from Atheism and despair! Such is the prayer of De Pressensé; and surely no American Christian will fail to send across the ocean his earnest response.

The Gospel according to St. Matthew. With Notes: Intended for Sabbath-Schools, Families, and Ministers. By NATHANIEL MARSHMAN WILLIAMS. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 332. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1870.

As a scholarly production for popular use Mr. Williams's Matthew is a marked success, indicating that he need not fear to finish the New Testament in similar style. He brings down his work to the latest dates. He states and maintains his views as a Baptist without reserve, but without just offense to those from whom he differs. For those desiring a manual Calvinistic Commentary later than Barnes, and free from the pedantic heaviness of Owen, this is the proper book.

Mr. Williams quotes a statement of our own implying that Calvinism maintains that God decrees the sin and damns the sinner for the sin decreed, and says that such doctrine is taught neither by Baptists, Congregationalists, nor Episcopalians. But, dear Mr. Williams, do not Baptists and Congregationalists teach that God, anterior to all foreknowledge, foreordains whatsoever comes to pass? If God foreordains sin he decrees sin, and also decrees the damnation for that decreed sin. That is, he decrees the sin and damns the sinner.

Robert Barclay's Apology is on our table, and from it we present to Mr. Williams the following extracts from Calvinistic standards, on his unquestionable authority:

"I say, that by the ordination and will of God Adam fell. God would have man to fall. Man is blinded by the will and commandment of God. We refer the causes of hardening us to God. The highest or remote cause of hardening is the will of God. It followeth that the hidden counsel of God is the cause of hardening."* These are Calvin's expressions. "God," saith Beza, "hath predestinated not only unto damnation, but also unto the causes of it, whomsoever he saw meet."† "The decree of God cannot be excluded from the causes of corruption."‡ "It is certain," saith Zanchius, "that God is the first cause of obduration. Reprobates are held so fast under God's almighty decree that they cannot but sin and perish."§ "It is the opinion," saith Pareus, "of our doctors, that God did inevitably decree the temptation and fall of man. The creature sinneth indeed necessarily, by the most just judgment of God. Our men do most rightly affirm that the fall of man was necessary and inevitable, not by accident, because of God's decree."‖ "God," saith Martyr, "doth incline and force the wills of wicked men into great sins."¶ "God," saith Zuinglius, "moveth the robber to kill. He killeth, God forcing him thereunto. But thou wilt say, He is forced to sin; I permit, truly, that he is forced."** "Reprobate persons," saith Piscator, "are absolutely ordained to this twofold end—to undergo everlasting punishment, and necessarily to sin; and therefore to sin, that they may be justly punished."††

If Calvin and his followers do not here teach that God decrees the sin and damns the sinner for the sin decreed, please let it be shown.

* Calvin in cap. 3. Gen. Id. 1. Inst. c. 18. S., Id. lib. de Præd. Id. lib. de Provid. Id. Inst c. 23, S. 1.
† Beza, lib. de Præd. ‡ Id. de Præd. ad. Art. 1.
§ Zanch. de Excœcat. q. 5. Id. lib. 5 de Nat., Del. cap. 2, de Præd.
‖ Pareus, lib. 3. de Amis, gratiæ, c. 2. Ibid. c. 1. ¶ Martyr in Rom.
** Zuing. lib. de Prov. c. 5. †† Resp. ad Vorst. pa. 1, p. 120.

We believe in the distinction made between the *understanding* and the *spirit* in the human mind. Creeds are framed by the former, and worship breathed by the latter. We do beyond doubt adore the same God whom the spirit of the Calvinist worships, but it would be an awful sin in us to worship the God his creed describes.

Sermons of R. Winter Hamilton, D. D., LL. D., Author of "Rewards and Punishments," "Pastoral Appeals," etc. 12mo., pp. 480. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

"Write their memorial quickly," said Richard Winter Hamilton, "for ministers are soon forgotten." But Hamilton himself has not been forgotten. Scattered through our country there are single ministers, even of our own Church, who have fallen upon some production of his, and have hoarded it up as a rare *treasure trove.* The entertaining author of the Lamp of the Temple says that Dr. Stowell's biography of Hamilton, "a rag of a book," "shows that it is quite possible to write a very bad biography of *a very great man.*" "It is not enough to say that it was a bad biography; it is the worst biography of *a glorious man* we ever read."

Hamilton was celebrated for his conversational powers, his wide range of learning, his commanding oratory. His sermons remind us of what we heard once said of Dempster in his younger days: "He laid his foundations in the skies, and built upward." There is a grandeur in their build, there is a largeness in their component parts, that reminds you of an old cathedral. Of all American preachers he reminds us most of Henry B. Bascom. But what strikes one as a difference is, that with Bascom the grand pulpit oration was the end; when he had finished and received the assurance that his sermon was an oratorical success his entire object seemed gained. With the burning as well as lofty soul of Hamilton it was but a means, an instrument, upon which, as a production, he set no high estimate, since he was looking to a further end—the success of the cause for which he wrought.

His sermons cannot be recommended as a model. They serve as a mental stimulus. They are grand Miltonian poems. At the same time they are rich unfoldings of sacred truths, clothed in a style that tasks our language, and ennobling conceptions that task the reader's imagination.

The Prefatory Memoir of the author is—and we know not why

the title-page fails to say—written by Bishop Simpson. This Memoir is not, like Stowell's, "a rag of a book," but it does slender justice to Hamilton's stature of manhood.

An Apology for the True Christian Divinity, As the Same is Held Forth and Preached by the People in Scorn called Quakers. Being a Full Explanation and Vindication of their Principles and Doctrines, by Many Arguments deduced from Scripture and Right Reason. By ROBERT BARCLAY. Original Edition in Latin. First English Edition, 1678. Thirteenth Edition. 12mo., pp. 384. Manchester: William Irvin. 1869.

Whether there exists an American edition of Barclay's celebrated Apology we know not. We have not seen it since our boyhood, when we read it with singular interest. The copy before us reaches us from England, with greetings from an unknown "Friend," whose autographical name is "Joseph Armfield, South Place, Finsbury." There is a grave and simple dignity in Barclay's style which well represents the cause he explains and defends. There is much of a true and rich evangelicism in the doctrines he presents; much that is apostolical in his spirit. He is true to the doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, the perfection of Christian life, the free probation of man. There is a great truth in the doctrine of the "Inner Light." But when we come to his doctrine of worship, we at once see why it is, that with so much that is beautiful and holy, Quakerism is dwindling to a failure. This doctrine is a form of the old Antinomian "wait God's time." The Christian soul must be a passivity until the Spirit breathes it into activity. Voluntary and stated worship is idolatry. From this view arise inactivity, stupor, and death. We are sorry; there is so much that is sweet and tranquilizing in true Quaker piety that we can ill spare it in these noisy days.

Lange's Bibelwerk. Proverbs, by Dr. Otto Zöckler, Professor of Theology at Griefswald. Translated and Edited by Rev. CHARLES AIKEN, Ph. D., Union College. Ecclesiastes, by Otto Zöckler. Edited by Professor TAYLER LEWIS. Translated by Professor WILLIAM WELLS, Union College. Song of Solomon, by Otto Zöckler. Translated, with additions, by W. H. GREEN, D. D., Professor, Princeton College. 8vo., pp. 594. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

This volume is, we think, the gem of the set. After Genesis, no part of the Old Testament presents a more perplexing problem than these products of the Solomonian Theosophy. The blended genius of Germany and America has contrived to furnish as good a solution of the whole as ever was bound in a single volume. In Proverbs we find inspiration coming to the sphere of common sense and practical good conduct, exhibiting religion in

its shaping contact on every-day life. In Ecclesiastes we find the same inspiration sympathizing with the perplexities of Rationalism, and gently guiding it to the fear of God. In the Songs we have a type of a future in which this practical Ethic is to be inspired, and this Rationalism is to be illumined with the power and presence of a divine love.

Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, with Special Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübinger School. By GEORGE P. FISHER, Professor in Yale College. New and enlarged Edition. 8vo., pp. 620. New York: Scribner & Co. 1870.

This is a new edition of a work which we have already noticed with high commendation. The skeptical theories of Baur and the other Tübingen divines are counteracted by Neander and Schaff in their apostolic histories, by a counter statement of the facts, with sidelong argumentative replies; but there is no formal answer in our language so full and complete as this. The Life of St. Paul by Renan, lately republished in this country, is to a great degree a transformation of the theories of Baur into factitious history, and so far these Essays are a refutation of this book.

In the present edition Professor Fisher has added an Introduction and Notes, bringing the discussion to the present hour. They materially increase the value of the work.

The Apostolical and Primitive Church Popular in its Government, Informal in its Worship. A Manual on Prelacy and Ritualism. Carefully Revised and adapted to these Discussions. By LYMAN COLEMAN, D. D., Professor in Lafayette College, author of "Ancient Christianity Exemplified," etc. 12mo., pp. 413. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1869.

Dr. Coleman was a personal friend of Neander's; and as Neander's Introduction, written for the book, evinces, the views of the eminent German are in general by him well represented. Dr. Coleman conclusively shows that no proof whatever exists that a successional triad of orders was ever established by divine authority as the test or condition of the reality of a Church. He does not disprove that the Church is entitled to shape herself to such organic form as enables her to be most effective in spreading the knowledge of Christ. Ordination is the test that authenticates the rank of the individual in his particular Church, not the test that authenticates the validity of a Church itself. We are obliged to Dr. Coleman for an able and learned work.

Immortality. Four Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge, being the Hulsean Lectures for 1868. By J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, B. D., Vice-Principal, and Professor of Hebrew, in St. David's College, Lampeter Prebendary of St. David's, etc. 16mo., pp. 153. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1870.

Professor Perowne has produced thoughts somewhat fresh upon an old subject. He belongs to the most modern evangelical school of Christian thought, and his work retraces the old argument in view of the effrontéries of the modern Materialism and Atheism.

The Hebrew Bible. Revised and Carefully Examined. By MYER LEVI LETTERIS. 8vo., pp. 1,284. New York: John Wiley & Son. 1869.

This is a beautiful imprint of the Hebrew Old Testament. Its letter is clear, bold, and well defined. This edition has a standard reputation for accuracy of text, and may be safely recommended to students inquiring for the right Hebrew Bible.

Music-Hall Sermons. By WILLIAM H. H. MURRAY, Pastor of Park-street Church, Boston. 12mo., pp. 276. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1870.

The pastor of Park-street Church wields a keen and glittering blade. He has home truths to tell, and he tells them with a home-coming power.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Apologetische Beiträge. I. *Die Wunderthaten des Herrn,* II. *Die Leidensgeschichte des Herrn.* (Apologetical Contributions. I. The Miracles of our Lord. II. The History of our Lord's Passion.) By F. L. STEINMEYER. 8vo., pp. 254, 253. Berlin: Wiegandt & Greben. 1866.

Dr. Steinmeyer is one of the most earnest and evangelical theologians of Northern Germany, and his course of lectures on Pastoral Theology has made his room one of the most frequented in the Berlin University. That he is well able to perform good service in the apologetical field, now better and more largely cultivated than ever before, is abundantly proved in the present work. He directs his attention specially to the question of Christ's miracles and death, and shows that, internally, they are neither impossible nor improbable, but, on the contrary, that the accounts of his miracles, as furnished by the Gospels, are highly probable; nay, that their non-occurrence would have been most unlikely. They are more than a proof of Christ's divinity, because they are an essential part of his system for restoring man to his lost unity with God. There is a distinction between Christ's miracles as performed *by* his hand and word, and those performed by the

glory of the Father upon the Son. Among the latter belong Christ's miraculous birth and resurrection. In order to prove the credibility of the Gospel narratives, it must be shown, first, that Christ possessed miraculous power; and, second, that he performed those miracles which the Evangelists report. Now, according to Prophecy, the Gospels and the Epistles—the united testimony of the whole Bible—Christ was the Messiah, the Son of God; and if he were this, it would be impossible that he should not have the power of performing miracles. Twesten says: "The greatest miracle of the Scriptures is the origin of God's kingdom in its twofold evolution, the preparatory Israelitish Theocracy, and its definitive form in the origin of Christianity; all other miracles are grouped around this as accompanying phenomena." In this sentiment Dr. Steinmeyer heartily coincides. In weighing the worth of Christ's miracles, we must not regard them as a mere triumph over nature, but must look at the meaning of them, which was the triumph over sin. They were signs of the coming kingdom of God, symbols of the blessings contained in God's kingdom, proofs of the effective power of God's kingdom, and prophecies of its future glory. In studying the miracles of Christ, we fail to catch their meaning unless we look clearly at God's kingdom, and observe them as being designed for it. Taking these thoughts as a basis, all of Christ's miracles fall into four groups: miracles as symptoms; miracles as symbols; miracles as proofs; miracles as prophecies. In reference to the question of Christ's death, and its relation to all mankind, Dr. Steinmeyer makes no concession whatever, save, perhaps, on the score of God's wrath, but contends that the history of the suffering Saviour, as the Evangelists relate, presupposes that he was designed by the Father as a propitiation for human sin; that the sin of the world was, so to speak, *exhausted* by the suffering of the Saviour.

Too much praise cannot be awarded the author for the pains with which he has examined the entire literature of the subject, though, if he can be said to err at all, it is in too frequently cutting the thread of his argument by citation. Yet it would be difficult to find a writer who demeans himself more independently amid such an array of excellent company. He follows every stage of Christ's arrest, trial, crucifixion, and death, in minute detail, explaining all apparent or alleged discrepancies between the Gospels, meeting every natural theory started by the skeptics of all classes by the acuteness of his reasoning, constantly ap-

pealing to the meaning of the original text, examining the deep psychological causes controlling the actions of both Christ's enemies and disciples, and unfolding the great purpose of God ignorantly subserved by the Jews, until their guilt reached its climax at the same moment that the redemption of man became an historical fact.

Der Kampf der Lutherischen Kirche um Luthers Lehre vom Abendmahl im Reformationszeitalter. Im Zusammenhang mit der gesammten Lehrentwicklung dieser Zeit dargestellt. (The Conflict of the Lutheran Church on Luther's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in the Time of the Reformation, in Connection with the whole Doctrinal Development of this Period.) Von Dr. Heinrich Schmid. 8vo., pp. xxiv, 344. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1868.

From the stand-point of the "straightest sect" of the Lutherans. The author seems to be alarmed that, amid the general restlessness under the old theological restraints of Lutheranism, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is coming in for its share of criticism, if not of actual change. Let us recall just what Luther held on this point: 1. That in the Lord's Supper there is such a union of the bread with the body of Christ, and of the wine with the blood of Christ, that the one is presented in, with, and by the other, (*in, cum, et sub pane et vino;*) 2. The mouth is the organ by which the one is received as well as the other, (*manducatio oralis;*) 3. That the body and blood are communicated to all who receive it, whether believers or unbelievers. Dr. Schmid aims to show that Luther never changed this view of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper—which we think a very doubtful compliment—and that therefore the Lutheran Church of the present day will prove false to its principles, and must necessarily decline, if it renounce one iota of Luther's opinion on this point. To carry out this object it was necessary to travel over the whole field of agitation on the doctrine from the time of the Wittenberg Concord to the adoption of the Form of Concord, and he does this with critical care and historical fidelity. The work is introduced by a statement of its general object. The principal divisions are: The Wittenberg Concord; Has Luther's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper been expressed in the Confessional Writings of the Lutheran Church? Has the Confessional Position of the Lutheran Church been changed by the Transformations which Melanchthon introduced into the Augustana? The Westphalian Controversy; The Bremen Controversy; The Controversy in the Palatinate; The Entrance of the Würtemberg Theologians into the Controversy; The Drama in Electoral Saxony; The Efforts of the Princes for attaining Ecclesiastical Peace. The

account of Luther's controversy with Zwingli (pp. 29–55) on the Lord's Supper, which Dr. Schmid clothes with really dramatic interest, strikes us as the best part of his book. His description of Luther's wrath when Froschauer, a bookseller of Zurich, sent him Leo Judæ's Latin translation of the Bible, is a picture of itself. He even has the frankness to tell us what Luther said, after indignantly sending the book back, that he wanted Froschauer to send him no more books, that he would have no share in the blasphemous teaching of the Swiss Reformers, whom it would be a blessing to the Church to get rid of as soon as possible, and that the judgment of Zwingli would certainly overtake his followers if they kept on in that way. Bullinger's remark on reading Luther's letter is well known: "May God pardon his great sin!" Luther's case, as might be expected, is defended with all the devotion of a disciple. But, as a clear historical statement of the controversy on the doctrine in question during the period of the Reformation, we doubt whether this work has its superior in German theology. It merits a place, on this special doctrine, beside Planck's History of Protestant Theology from Luther's Death to the Introduction of the Form of Concord, and Heppe's History of German Protestantism, to both of which works it may be regarded as an indispensable supplement.

Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments. (Manual of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament.) Von Dr. BERNHARD WEISS, Professor der Theologie. 8vo., pp. xii, 736. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz. 1868.

The starting-point for biblical theology, according to Dr. Weiss, is not the life of Jesus in itself, in its historical course, but the ideas which were based on the earliest tradition by the New Testament writers. These ideas were conditioned first by the doctrine of Jesus himself, so far as it explained his person and his appearance. In this sense a representation of the doctrines of Jesus forms the fundamental section of biblical theology, while the facts of his life can only be considered so far as they are assumed in this doctrine, or made the standard for understanding it.

Professor Weiss first gives an introduction on the biblical theology of the New Testament, in which he traces the growth of the separation of ecclesiastical from New Testament theology; how the Reformation produced a return to the New Testament standard; how the systematic attempt was again made, through Sebastian Schmidt, Hülsemann, Baier, Weissmann, and Zickler,

covering a space of almost a century, (1671–1765,) to separate the contents of the Scriptures from dogmatics, and how Neander was the first to spiritually conceive and scientifically establish the real science of New Testament theology. As for the scope of the work, we must be content simply to state its outline. Introduction to the Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Part I: The Doctrine of Jesus according to the Oldest Tradition. Part II: The Original Apostolical Doctrinal Type in the Pre-Pauline Period. Part III: Paulinism. Part IV: The Original Apostolical Doctrinal Type in the Post-Pauline Period. Part V: The Johannean Theology.

In our view, no portion of the book is so interesting as this last part, bearing on the Johannean theology. The language with which he opens it is worthy of repetition:

> The biblical and theological worth of John's Gospel is by no means dependent on the denial of its credibility. A strict distinction between the substance of the words of Jesus, arising from faithful recollection, and their Johannean conception and representation, is neither possible nor necessary, since they were his spiritual possession only in the form delivered by the preceding Evangelists, but yet essentially decided his own doctrinal view. Yet biblical theology must distinguish, in various ways, between what John expressly describes as the doctrine of the Master, and that which was developed from it by an individual and independent conception of it.

Of John's Gospel he says further:

> It represents the appearance of Jesus throughout from the point of view of the popular Messianic idea. The scriptural prophecy of the Messiah is proved to be fulfilled in manifold ways. The promised Messiah is recognized upon the basis of Christ's self-testimony, as the only begotten Son of the Father. John beheld his divine glory in Christ's works, proving his omnipotence, as well as in his words, proving his omniscience.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Sketches of Creation: A Popular View of Some of the Grand Conclusions of the Sciences in Reference to the History of Matter and of Life. Together with a Statement of the Intimations of Science respecting the Primordial Condition and the Ultimate Destiny of the Earth and the Solar System. By ALEXANDER WINCHELL, LL.D., Professor of Geology, Zoology, and Botany in the University of Michigan, and Director of the State Geological Survey. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 459. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Professor Winchell clothes, in a very rich and popular style, the grand hypotheses of scientific men with regard to the origin of the earth in nebular fire and its termination in solar fire. *Hypotheses* we call these; for as yet no demonstration of truth has taken them from the rank of probabilities. Of this fact the title gives warning, and we could wish that the body of the work had sometimes given the "statements" a little less categorical air.

Primordially, all matter existed in a state of heated vapor diffused through immensity; which having acquired centers, concentrated in the process of cooling into an immense whirling vapory globe. This globe, in its revolutions, flung off successive masses of its nebulous matter, which, in like whirling and cooling conditions, also condensed into so many fire-globes revolving around the great central flaming globe. The solar system thus came into being as an immense spinning wheel of globes revolving around the central hub. Each of the globes flung off lesser globes, which became their attendant moons.

Upon the fire-ball which we call earth there gathered, by refrigeration, a rocky crust. Through its thickening shell the turbulent fires within upheaved the mountains and continents upon the surface. The humid elements of the nebula, driven by the heat to the distant margin of the globe, when the cooling process was sufficiently advanced condensed into water, and descending in a cosmical storm of a thousand years' duration, became the ocean. Then came the first *vital spark*, animating a jelly mite, whose descendants are still visible to the microscope of the present day; an infinitesimal monument of the permanence of species! Then rose the four great separate columns of life, ascending through all the geologic aeons; each column embracing a variety of forms within its own circle, yet never transgressing its own periphery; all the columns advancing in perfection, not by an unbroken line of developments, but by a series of new but analogous creations. These creations science has never yet been able to extricate from the category of *miracles* of blended wisdom and power. The last great upheaval, being in the arctic region, poured a cosmical glacier down upon our hemisphere, which in its awful power really improved the earth's surface for future purposes. After this great glacier-period appeared *Man*, the capital of life, the fulfillment of a countless series of types and prophecies in the great scripture of creation. He appeared in the completeness of his humanity, with a vast unbridged chasm between him and the lower orders. His nature and history indicate that in him is the terminus; no higher species is to appear as the result of any future geologic epoch.

The remnants of the glacier-period, still existing in Central Europe, indicate that it has hardly yet closed. The stupendous antiquity claimed for man is, therefore, not maintainable. The fact that his early existence was contemporaneous with that of the cave-bear and mammoth only proves the late existence of

those animals. They, like many other animals, whose extinction is matter of history, have disappeared during the human period. The Professor's paragraphs on this subject will be read with interest.

Of all this wonderful history science reveals a most inglorious termination. The rain-storms of thousands of years will level our mountains to the plain; and the rivers carrying the waters to the ocean will dry up the sources of irrigation, and reducing the continents to a desert, will starve us all to death! Next, over the leveled continents, the waters gaining the ascendency, the ocean will spread her relentless sheet and drown us all! After a due number of millions of years the heat will have completely radiated from the earth, which will be thereby transformed into an ice-ball, freezing us all to death! After a few millions more, friction will have so diminished the earth's orbit as, by the aid of gravitation, to fling us, with the rest of the planets, into the great burning sun, and burn us up! Finally, the sun itself will not only cool to an iceberg, but rush, by similar causes that have destroyed the earth, into the great central sun, of which it is but a planet, and that central sun into *its* central destroyer; and so on to the end of the chapter—if this awful chapter has an end. Of all these direful conclusions science is sure—provided she is in possession of all the existing premises. The only contingency is, that some unknown premise may interfere and effect a different result.

He who believes in the first advent and the incarnation is able also to believe in the second advent and the judgment. The advent of Christ is the great direct interposition of divinity into the historical series of the great process of nature. It is the great connective between the supernatural and natural worlds. Hence the hypothetical certainties of science in regard to the natural future of our earth are to be held subject to possible supernatural variations.

Professor Winchell is gifted with no ordinary power of investing science with the attractiveness of romance. He handles a large affluence of language with masterly skill, and his vivid pictures and illustrative imageries are often blended with touches of quaint and graceful pleasantry. This great nature-history ends, indeed, not like a romance, at the zenith of felicity, but, like a tragedy, in tears and catastrophe. Earthly life is, indeed, profoundly tragic. It is the hope of immortality alone which gives any lofty ideality to man's existence. It is by clinging fast to faith in God, in Immortality, in Revelation, that Professor Win-

chell is able to shed a relieving light upon the dismal contradiction between man's high human history and the sole terminus that science is able to conjecture. We are glad to learn that we are to receive from his able pen another volume, discussing "The Antiquity of the Human Race, the Unity of the Race, the Primeval Condition of Man, Harmony of Mosaic and Geologic Cosmogonies, the Foreshadowing of Man's Birthplace, the Unity of Creation, Teleological and Homological Design in Nature." Snappish as many of our scientific writers persist in being toward the theologians, the theologians listen with great deference to what the scientists say touching theological topics. We look with interest for the coming volume.

We think that even Professor Winchell makes some allusions of this kind (pp. 46, 47) which he will find it difficult to justify. What "leading theologians" have said that the nebular hypothesis is atheistic? On the other hand, if we rightly remember, it was upon this theory that La Place told Napoleon that he had no need of the "hypothesis" of a God. Upon the nebular theory it is that Herbert Spencer bases his denial of intelligence to the Unknown Absolute. We could largely extend this list; and though we affirm no atheistic consequences, we doubt whether many atheists can be found who do not assume this theory as a postulate. With what propriety, then, can Professor Winchell select "theologians" as responsible for this reproach? And, then, why does the Professor say that Whewell and Buchanan were "crowded to a response" before they "admitted" that the nebular theory is not to be atheistic? Both these theologians simply treated the subject in their professional routine, and were no more "crowded" than Professor Winchell. It seems that theologians can neither speak nor be silent without encountering this jaunty arrogance from certain "leading" savans. We suggest to them that the epoch of the *plantations* has past, and it is time that "plantation manners" should have fossilized with them.

The Tripartite Nature of Man—Spirit, Soul, and Body. Applied to Illustrate and Explain the Doctrines of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body. By Rev. J. B. HEARD, M. A. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 8vo., pp. 363. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1868.

Mr. Heard divides man's nature into spirit, soul, and body; or God-consciousness, self-consciousness, and sense-consciousness. Before the fall, these existed in their due proportionate power. By the fall, the spirit, or God-consciousness, has become dead-

ened. The spirit, *pneuma*, exists in fallen man in the form of conscience. It is quickened in conversion, and obtains greater and more complete ascendency by sanctification. At death the sense-consciousness is dropped, and the soul and *pneuma* coexist in the intermediate state, undergoing an increasing spiritual concentration from the sensible to the inner sphere. Hence, when at the resurrection the sense-consciousness is restored, the whole is so permeated by spirit as to be a spiritual body.

Mr. Heard's book is rather interesting, though it does not appear to be the work of a master mind. We think he errs in confining the highest range of the threefold nature exclusively to the religious side. A true philosophy does find in man an upper transcendental department, embracing the intuitions or pure reason. Here lies the superiority *in kind* of human over brute mind. By these intuitions we cognize the Infinite, the Eternal, the Ethical, and the Divine. No enlargement, no intensification of brute thought, would produce these ideas. They are additions to, not developments of, animal mind. Now of this higher department of man's mental nature the religious side is what Mr. Heard calls God-consciousness, a term of very unacceptable uncouthness. The amiable and pious materialist, David Hartley, invented the far preferable term *theopathy* (admitting *theopathic* and *theopathically*) to express the same thing, namely, man's susceptibility to the religious emotions. Of this higher department, the *νοῦς* of Greek philosophy, the *πνεῦμα* of the New Testament, is the sacred side. And with this enlargement we think the tripartite nature of man is a truth to be recognized both in philosophy and theology. Beyond all question man shares the vegetative life of plants, the animal life of brutes, and the pneumatic life of spiritual intelligences. The *anima* gives individuality to the *pneuma;* the *pneuma* gives an immortality to the *anima*. On this subject our readers may consult an article translated by us from Olshausen, in our Quarterly for April, 1859, which develops, we think, the real truth upon this subject.

Principles of a System of Philosophy. An Essay toward solving some of the more Difficult Questions in Metaphysics and Religion. By AUSTIN BIERBOWER, A. M. 16mo., pp. 240. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1870.

Mr. Bierbower's so-called system is an elaboration of the ordinary principle of Theodicy that even Omnipotence is limited in its operations by absolute necessity, being under the law of non-contradiction. This principle lies at the basis of Professor Bledsoe's

very able Theodicy; it is analyzed in our own work on the Freedom of the Will. Mr. Bierbower has done the work in the style of an independent and individualistic thinker, and his work is well worthy the attention of metaphysicians. His Theodicy is Arminian; we may safely say ultra-Arminian, as he maintains that as God's omnipotence is qualified by non-contradiction, so is his omniscience. As omnipotent power cannot be supposed to do the *undoable*, so infinite knowledge, in order to be infinite, is not required to know the *unknowable*. Calvinists decry this principle as undeifying God, as our notice of Dr. Schaff's folly on this point in our last Quarterly illustrates; but Calvinists really assume the same principle at every step, and their own system is built upon it. Mr. Bierbower is a young writer; has gone to Germany for awhile; and we predict for him, as a true born metaphysician, (as rare a being as a true born poet,) a future of which this youthful production is but an omen.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Pope and the Council. By JANUS. Authorized translation from the German. 12mo., pp. 346. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1870.

This book is destined to be a permanent classic. It has a mission peculiarly its own. In the entire great discussion of the Reformation nothing so perplexes the honest inquirer as the wholesale Romanistic denunciation of every adverse statement as "a Protestant lie." So fundamental are the questionings of the truthfulness of every Protestant statement, or the genuineness of any quotation, however well authenticated, that the very fact that it is in a Protestant book becomes, even to a Protestant, a ground of doubt. But this book is written by a Catholic. Its learning is profound and absolute beyond any question. Its tone is calm and self-possessed, its style transparent and gently eloquent. It is Popery described by an adherent of the Pope.

And it is a terrible picture. No Protestant need desire to see it drawn in darker colors or with more faithful strokes. No one who believes in its narrative need ever doubt any standard Protestant book. It authenticates the great indictment, and renders its worst counts credible. We have here true honest Catholicism, in the light of historic research, making its explicit confessions to the nineteenth century. It is a step taken toward bringing the discussion to a clear conclusion when truth comes at last, from the Catholic side, in fullness and power.

The first chapter of twenty pages deals with the Syllabus, and expounds its issue with the freedom and progress of the nineteenth century. Nearly fifty pages handles the infallibility of the Popes; showing the blunders, contradictions, and heresies of former Popes, and stating, as the verdict of history, that no infallibility, and in fact no Popeship, was ascribed to the Bishop of Rome in the early centuries. Then comes the most appalling chapter of "Forgeries." It takes forty-six pages of this work to give the details of the forgeries upon which the claims of the Popedom were first based; to which are added twelve pages of "Dominican Forgeries," perpetrated at a later period for the same purpose. It requires this extent of space to unfold these demonstrated lies; not because they are difficult to prove or complex in their details, but because they are multitudinous in number, stupendous in magnitude, and involving a narrative of deliberate dishonesty that challenges the world for a parallel. Nor are they at all irrelevant in the argument. Upon these stupendous lies, as a foundation, the Popedom is built. When historical criticism placed their absolute dishonesty beyond debate, the Popedom was logically ended; but, alas! the structure of power had acquired such strength that it stands firm long after the foundations of apparent truth are removed.

The chapter on the Inquisition possesses a fearful and profound interest. Janus shows that the Court of Rome uniformly was the disgrace of Christendom by its debaucheries, dishonesties, and manifold immoralities; and that it established the Inquisition to crush the moral outcry of the Christian conscience. The entire succession of Popes after its establishment personally insisted on the utmost rigor of its inflictions. "The indication and carrying out must be ascribed *to the Popes alone*." The pretext that it is not the Church, but the civil magistrate, that is responsible for the inquisitorial executions, is thus handled:

> The binding force of the laws against heretics lay not in the authority of secular princes, but in the sovereign dominion of life and death over all Christians, claimed by the Popes as God's representatives on earth.* Every prince or civil magistrate, according to the constant doctrine of the Court of Rome, was to be compelled simply to carry out the sentence of the inquisitors, by the following process: first, the magistrates were themselves excommunicated on their refusal, and then all who held intercourse with them. If this was not enough, the city was laid under interdict. If resistance was still prolonged, the officials were deprived of their posts, and, when all these means were exhausted, the city was deprived of intercourse with other cities, and its Bishop's see removed.

On the cruelties of the Inquisition, take the following passage:

> The tribunal, as carried on in all important points down to the fourteenth century, and described in Eymerich's classical work, presents a phenomenon singular

* As Innocent III. expressly states it, "non puri hominis sed veri Dei vicemgerens."

in human history. Here mere suspicion sufficed for the application of torture; it was by an act of grace that you were imprisoned for life between four narrow walls, and fed on bread and water, and it was a conscientious obligation for a son to give up his own father to torture, perpetual imprisonment, or the stake. Here the accused was not allowed to know the names of his accusers, and all means of legal protection were withheld from him; there was no right of appeal, and no aid of legal adviser allowed him. Any lawyer who undertook his cause would have incurred excommunication. Two witnesses were enough to secure conviction, and even the depositions of those refused a hearing in all other trials, either from personal enmity to the accused, or on account of public infamy, such as perjurers, panders, and malefactors, were admitted. The inquisitor was forbidden to show any pity; torture in its severest form was the usual means of extorting confessions. No recantation or assurance of orthodoxy could save the accused; he was allowed confession, absolution, and communion, and his profession of repentance and change of mind was accepted *in foro sacramenti*, but he was told at the same time that it would not be accepted judicially, and he must die if he were a relapsed heretic. Lastly, to fill up the measure, his innocent family was deprived of its property by legal confiscation, half of it passing into the Papal treasury, the other half into the hands of the inquisitors. Life only, said Innocent III., was to be left to the sons of misbelievers, and that as an act of mercy. They were therefore made incapable of civil offices and dignities.

To us as American freemen a most vital point is the issue of Rome with constitutional freedom. The Syllabus, as Janus shows, pronounces "modern civilization" a "damnable error;" and then he adds, "Every existing constitution in Europe, with the sole exception of Russia and the Roman States, is an outgrowth of this modern civilization." He shows how the spiritual claims of Rome do truly arrogate absolute power of every thing human, whether religious or political. He shows historically, not only that such claims have been executed to the full extent of Romish power, but that to the latest dates Rome has been the foe of European freedom. "The modern civil constitutions, and the efforts for self-government and the limitation of arbitrary royal power, are in the strongest contradiction to Ultramontanism, the very kernel and ruling principle of which is the consolidation of absolutism in the Church. . . . Hence the profound hatred, at the bottom of the soul of every genuine Ultramontane, of free institutions and the whole constitutional system."

The Pope cursed the English Magna Charta, and excommunicated the English barons who obtained it. The Pope condemned the French constitution after the fall of the first Bonaparte. Parliaments in Bavaria, Italy, and Austria are his abhorrence. In view of this war, waged by the Papacy to the stretch of its power against civil liberty, significant is the statement that in the Œcumenical Council the Bishops from America (we can scarce call these individuals American Bishops) are among the most determinate supporters of the infallible autocracy of the old Italian despot. No one who reads Janus can doubt that

every one of these mitered gentlemen is an enemy of American freedom. These dark, designing tools of a foreign despot only want the power! If allegiance to a foreign power disqualifies for American citizenship, these men are bound by the ties of the most abject devotion to the most concentrated of all foreign despotisms. No government on earth has an oath of so iron-clad a force as that which binds the American papist, clerical and secular, to that decrepit, old, Italian priest. That allegiance pretends to be only spiritual; but let the hour of trial come, and the spiritual swallows all human interests. Give him the power and the Pope would give the word, and the Inquisition, in all its rigors, would darken over this very city of New York and this very nation of free America. That power they can never acquire, but they deserve none the less our detestation for the will we know they possess. Whenever the Popish priest stalks through our streets, we know him as a man who would put the thumb-screw on us if he could. The meek-faced nun, conscientious and pious as she is, bears in her subdued face the marks of that abject obedience to the lords of her soul which would actuate her, at their bidding, to hold the bowl that catches the blood flowing from tortured limbs. Accursed be that dark and bloody system that in the name of all that is holy can thus twist the gentlest fibers of the human soul into a complicity with all that is atrocious. That power, thank God, will never come; but none the less burning is our indignation at the American demagogues that play into the hands of these enemies of our freedom and our country.

John Wesley's Place in Church History, Determined with the Aid of Facts and Documents unknown to, or unnoticed by, his Biographers. By R. Denny Urlin, of the Middle Temple, Barrister at Law; Member of the Royal Irish Academy; Author of "The Office of Trustee," etc. etc. 12mo., pp. 272. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1870.

The reader who expects to find in the present volume a philosophical attempt to fix the true status of Wesley in history is doomed to disappointment. He will find simply a one-sided, though not uncandid, contribution, from a High Churchman, to a discussion going on in England on the subject of bringing English Methodism into organic subjection to the English hierarchy. It is written in a chaste, gentlemanly, and conciliatory style. It professes to show that Wesley was a diligent student of the Fathers of the first three centuries; that he drew many of the peculiarities of Methodism, both doctrinal and institutional, from the primitive Greek Church;

that he personally to the last observed many ritualisms, which he did not prescribe to others; and that he had a sermon, which he preached repeatedly to his preachers, against separation from the Church, and against administering the ordinances without Episcopal ordination, and which, indeed, he delivered for the last time about a year before his death.

Among the ritualisms practiced, or at least believed in, as it is claimed, by Wesley in his earlier years, yet after the formation of his Societies, was *prayers for the pious dead.* In proof of this fact a memorandum, professing such belief, is found in his handwriting, on which paper is also a catalogue of the names belonging to one of his religious classes.

This discussion we may safely leave in the hands of our English brethren, so far as England is concerned. So far as American Methodism is concerned, Wesley most wisely founded our Episcopacy. For this act, although not at all necessary to the validity of our Church and ministry, we cannot be too grateful to God. He gave us a Bishop earlier than the Church of England gave a Bishop to America. Ours here is the oldest Episcopate. It may be, indeed, that practically the question of ordaining for us an ordaining minister was a question of life or death to American Methodism. Death, total death it would have been, had we been subjected to the absolute ukase of a Hobart, forbidding the existence of a prayer-meeting! Far more would the same narrow-minded ecclesiastic have extinguished the camp-meeting, the class-meeting, the love-feast, the watch-night, and the revival. And this goes conclusively against the whole system of Church despotism founded on the doctrine of an exclusive *jure divino* successional ordination and sacrament. It puts the freedom of a spiritual people into the hands of a close corporation, compacted together by a corporeal and manual performance. As an expedient form of recognition in any organized Church, sanctioned through ages, the imposition of hands will ever be retained. But to make it the divine cement of an immutable hierarchy is one of the departing follies of Christendom.

Our Episcopalian friends in this country cannot clear their heads of the fancy that we Methodists feel the existence of a certain defect in our Church from the absence of a successional Episcopate, and that the only difficulty of reunion arises from our reluctance to re-ordination. They are totally mistaken. If it would advance the cause of pure Christianity and peace, we would consent to be re-ordained every day in the year. But to

replace ourselves under the Episcopal close-corporation, which an obligatory successionalism creates, would be submitting alive to a fossilization.

History of the Apostolic Church. With a General Introduction to Church History. By PHILIP SCHAFF, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburgh, Pa. Translated by EDWARD D. YEOMANS. 8vo., pp. 684. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER. 1867.

We have had occasion to use Dr. Schaff's work as a reference, and we are able to speak highly of its quality. Church History, rather than Theology, appears to us to be the learned author's forte. The volume opens with an extensive survey of the Literature of Ecclesiastical History, furnishing to the student a view of the whole ground. These chapters are truly valuable, both from the views presented and from the impulse they are calculated to give, in our country, to this great department of Christian study. The ideal presented by Dr. Schaff of Church History is the true one; and, pursued in accordance with that idea, rich, practical fruit can be gathered from that field.

In tracing the events, portraying the characters, and discussing the principles presented by his subject, Dr. Schaff shows the power of a master. He excels in giving a compact summing up of the entire materials of a topic. Even where we object to his process or conclusions, we feel that the views we oppose are stated in a standard and classical style. In going over the same ground with Pressensé, we find him no way inferior in learning or power of statement. But, by separating the discussion from the narrative, Pressensé has written a far more *readable* history. Effort is required to study Schaff; effort is required to stop reading Pressensé.

We fully agree with Dr. Schaff, that the ultra-Protestantism which refuses to recognize European Catholicism as a Church, and as a great Christian development, plays dangerously into the hands of skepticism. He does not overstate the good done by medieval Catholicism. Modern Europe owes a vast debt even to the Papacy, and, we might add, even to some of its prominent vices. Nor need we say that the Church of Thomas à Kempis, Pascal, and Fénélon has afforded a saintship of high order. But when he uses that as an argument to prove that the Papacy is not Antichrist, however true the conclusion, it is not proved by the logic. He seems to us to forget, as he seldom does, the opposite phases that the same object often presents. Human governments, for instance, on one side, are truly the *beasts* that Daniel pictures them; but, on the other side, they are, with Paul, the *ministers of God.*

In arguing that Papacy is not Antichrist because Rome is a true successional Church, does he not forget that Antichrist *sitteth in the temple of God?* 2 Thess. ii, 4. And when he argues from John that Papacy cannot be Antichrist, because Antichrist denies that Christ has come in the flesh, does he not overlook how John, in a secondary sense, declares that there were elementally *many Antichrists*, even in his own day? It is a fearful initial fact that Antichrist, if to be identified with the *beast* of the Apocalypse, is located by the apocalyptic writer *at Rome.* However we may doubt what this Antichrist is, no one can doubt *where* it is. And if Antichrist, at Rome, *sitteth in the temple of God*, then Antichrist is located and seated in the Romish Christian Church.

Outlines of Wesleyan Bibliography; or, A Record of Methodist Literature from the Beginning. In two parts: The first containing the publications of John and Charles Wesley arranged in order of time; the second those of Methodist Preachers alphabetically arranged. By G. OSBORN, D. D. 8vo. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1869.

Dr. Osborn's volume is very valuable as a permanent record, and as a convenient reference for the literary few.

The enumerations presented by Dr. Osborn in his preface are noteworthy. During a period of a hundred and thirty years the Methodist ministry has furnished to England more than six hundred and twenty authors. A large share of these were self-educated men, so far as they were educated at all, prompted to thinking and writing by their religion.

Dr. Osborn's title is unlimited, comprehending all Methodism; but his book knows nothing of the existence of our continent, or of any Methodism or Methodist authorship upon it. He does not notice even American Methodist books, like Stevens's History, which have been republished and circulated broadcast in England. His book should have been immensely large, (probably thrice its present size,) or his title slightly smaller.

We may also note the fact that we receive the copy of this work, not from the Wesleyan Office, (which has no dealings with us,) but from Hodder & Stoughton, publishers for the English Independents. Neither Dr. Porter nor Dr. Lanahan has been able to establish any business intercourse with the English Methodist publishing interest—by which sleepiness we imagine the latter are the losers. We formerly noted the fact that Bledsoe's Theodicy, which originated with us, was republished in England by a non-Methodist house, and the notice of the work reached us by the Westminster Review.

Studies in Church History. The Rise of the Temporal Power—Benefit of Clergy—Excommunication. By HENRY C. LEA. 12mo., pp. 515. Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea. 1869.

We noticed with high appreciation, in a former Quarterly, Mr. Lea's monographs entitled Superstition and Force, a gleaning from Church history, similar in character to the present. He has since published a sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church. These productions are remarkable for their scholarly research into original sources, and for their perfectly pure and impartial historic spirit. They deal in a most dispassionate manner with areas of history over which the storms of controversy have for centuries been sweeping. They are clear contributions to the great work of arriving at true and safe conclusions. Mr. Lea has not the grandly marching rhetoric of Lecky; but he possesses, we think, a calmer, clearer spirit, a more undisturbed discrimination, and a truer appreciation of the divine as blending and co-operating with the human in Church history. We may also remark by the way, that Mr. Lecky himself characterizes Mr. Lea's tractate on Celibacy as "one of the most valuable works that America has produced." Mr. Lea's forte has thus far appeared in tracing the rise and progress of certain special institutes in history. His work is rather critical and colorless, leaving little scope for portraiture and pictorial sketching.

The Andes and the Amazon; or, Across the Continent of South America. By JAMES ORTON, M. A., Professor of Natural History in Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. With a New Map of Equatorial America, and numerous Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 356. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Professor Orton brings vividly into view that beautiful valley of the Amazon that spreads broadly enough to take in the entire area of our own inhabited States, under a sun blander than shines upon Italy, where reigns not an eternal summer, but all the seasons blend in one gentle, uniform, Paradisaic temperament. It is one of the events of the age that the Amazon has been opened to commerce.

The Coming of Christ in his Kingdom, and "The Gates Wide Open" to the Future Earth and Heaven. Adventism, Millenarianism, and a Gross Materialism Exposed and Refuted, and the True Nature of Christ's Kingdom, as promised in the Latter-Day Glory of Earth, and the Consummated Glories of Heaven, Unfolded. By a Congregational Minister. 16mo., pp. 337. New York: N. Tibbals & Co.

The theory of this writer is, that there is no personal second advent of Christ; that the judgment-day to every man immediately succeeds death; and that the millennium is the predomi-

nance of Christianity in the future, perhaps endless, history of the earth. We have to dig out his theory as buried in a vast mass of irrelevant and trashy matter. The external finish of the work is in keeping with its internal.

Rambles through the British Isles; or, Where I Went, and What I Saw, in England, Ireland, and Scotland. By Rev. R. Harcourt. With Sixty Engravings. 12mo., pp. 349. New York: N. Tibbals & Son.

Mr. Harcourt is a young Methodist minister of New Jersey, whose lot, without any demerit of his own, it was to be born in Ireland. His contributions to our "Ladies' Repository" have, we believe, been very acceptable to its readers. His Rambles through the Isles of his native Britain are full of historical recollections, as if he were tracing the memories of the perceptions of his own spirit in a former state of existence. But he lives in the present as well as the past, and the living scenes and characters of Britain are alive in his pages. Home-staying people see all those things all the more vividly through the eyes of an acquaintance and friend, and there are thousands, we trust, who will be glad to view them through Mr. Harcourt's trusty optics.

A Genealogical History of the Descendants of Joseph Peck. who emigrated with his Family to this Country in 1638; and Records of his Fathers' and Grandfathers' Families in England; with Pedigrees extending back from Son to Father for Twenty Generations; with their Coats of Arms and Copies of Wills. Also an Appendix, giving an Account of the Boston and Hingham Pecks, the Descendants of John Peck of Meudon, Mass., Deacon Paul of Hartford, Deacon William and Henry of New Haven, and Joseph of Milford, Conn. With Portraits of Distinguished Persons, from Steel Engravings. By Ira B. Peck. 8vo., pp. 442. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son. 1868.

The name of Peck, Peke, or Pek, as it has been differently spelled, claims a high antiquity and a broad diffusion through Europe and America. The pedigree traced back to Joseph Peck is to be found in the British Museum. The present noble octavo has been gotten up by the author with great labor, care, and expense. It contains, among other fine and life-like engravings, excellent likenesses of Drs. George and Jesse T. Peck.

The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth. By the Rev. William Hanna D. D., LL. D., Author of "The Last Days of our Lord's Passion," "The Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection," etc. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Robt. Carter & Brothers. 1870.

This is the first of a series of volumes completely giving the Life of Christ in its successive periods. It is far superior to the ponder-

ous and misty Life of Christ by Lange, but inferior, at least in pictorial power, to that of Pressensé. It is a very valuable contribution to Christological literature.

The History of Rome. By THEODOR MOMMSEN. Translated, with the Author's sanction, and additions, by Rev. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D. Preface by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ. New Edition in 4 volumes. Vol. II. 12mo., pp. 598. New York: Scribner & Co. 1870.

The present volume of this great work has emerged from dissertation into history, so as to be to many minds more interesting. We shall give a full review of the entire work in our next Quarterly.

The Young Shetlander and his Home. By Rev. B. K. PEIRCE, D. D. Eleven Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 336. Blue and gold. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

Dr. Peirce here depicts with graceful pen a most interesting character amid very unique scenes. A fascinating volume.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

The Bible in the Public Schools. Arguments in the case of John D. Minor, *et al.*, *versus* The Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati, *et al.* Superior Court of Cincinnati. With the Opinions and Decisions of the Court. 8vo., pp. 420. Cincinnati: Robert Clark & Co. 1870.

The enterprising publishers have embodied this great trial in a noble octavo. The interest of the question, the ability displayed by the Counsel, the suspense of the appeal to a higher court, have attracted great attention to the case. We read Mr. Stallo's speech with admiration for its ability, and profound sorrow for its exertion on the wrong side.

Educational.

A German Course. Adapted to use in Colleges, High Schools, and Academies. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages and Æsthetics in Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 12mo., pp. 498. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Professor Comfort's name is familiar to our readers, if from no other reason, from his scholarly contributions to our Quarterly. He spent a period of his life in Europe with all his eyes and ears open. The present *course* is one of the results, of which there will, we trust, be many, of his acute and comprehensive observations while abroad. It is on the Ollendorf plan, yet with some

later modifications which will, we think, be found material improvements. Of its working success the teacher's experiments must be the final test; but from an examination, we do not see how it can fail to be a help in advance of any thing we have seen for the learner. It is well done up by the publishers.

Principles of Domestic Science; as applied to the Duties and Pleasures of Home. A Text-Book for the use of Young Ladies in Schools, Seminaries, and Colleges. By CATHARINE E. BEECHER and HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. 12mo., pp. 390. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 1870.

This volume has the Beecher smack. It abounds with original suggestions on practical topics within its range, and is imbued with the best spirit of Christian philanthropy.

Literature and Fiction.

Songs of Life. A Collection of Poems. By EDWARD HARTLEY DEWART. 16mo., pp. 256. Toronto: Dudley & Burns. 1869.

Mr. Dewart is the present able editor of the "Canada Christian Guardian," the organ of the Wesleyan Conference, and has given a new zest and value to that paper. He is favorably known to our readers as a too unfrequent contributor to our Quarterly. He has heretofore published a fine volume of selections from the poets of Canada, noticed with high commendation in a former Quarterly. That volume contained a number of his own poems, indicating that he was a genuine producer as well as an accomplished introducer.

In his modest preface Mr. Dewart says: "Many who have no capacity to enjoy the elaborate and involved sentences, remote and learned allusions, and 'deep inwoven harmonies' which delight those who have cultivated their taste, and adjusted their admiration to that standard, may, nevertheless, feel the power of a simple, earnest lyric, which conveys to the heart some truth never so deeply felt before." Many of the poems are in truth what he thus aims at, pleasing and graceful lyrics, expressing actual feelings awakened by surrounding events and objects. In easy, spirited versification, flexible command of language, and effective imagery, he attains all he attempts.

The pieces are classified as Songs of the World Without; Songs of the World Within; Songs of the Home and Heart; National and Patriotic Pieces; Miscellaneous. Among these we are specially attracted by the patriotic pieces, in which Canada is in-

vested with the hue of the poetic. The poet admits the absence of chivalric and historic charms; the non-existence of storied monuments; but then behold the "forests," "lakes as blue and vast as heaven above," "green and towering hills," and

> Cataracts sublime
> Where God unvails his majesty—
> Whose hymns make grandest melody
> That strikes the ear of Time.

The "Quebec Gazette" thus airily commences its spirited Centenary Song as the oldest of Canadian journals:

> Like the harbinger star that glimmers afar
> And heralds the rosy morn,
> A spirit of light, in the darksome night
> Of the by-gone years, I was born.
> The first of my race in this happy place,
> Where Freedom and Peace abide;
> For a hundred years, amid hopes and fears,
> I have breasted both wind and tide.

The poet greets the arrival of the eloquent William Morley Punshon in stanzas like this:

> Welcome! from the dear old land
> Where our fathers' ashes rest,
> Whose heroic deeds inspire
> Grateful pride in every breast.
> Albion's gifted son, to thee
> Give we love and honor due,
> To this land, where all are free,
> Welcome! we are BRITONS too.

Mr. Dewart is correct in rejoicing over the fact that he is a Briton—he might have been a Kamschatkan or a Frenchman! But then, on the other hand, he might have been a Yankee! his failure to become which, we think he should bewail in a few notes of tuneful pathos.

A Battle of the Books. Recorded by an Unknown Writer for the Use of Authors and Publishers: to the first for doctrine, to the second for reproof, to both for correction and for instruction in righteousness. Edited and published by GAIL HAMILTON. 12mo., pp. 288. Cambridge: Riverside Press. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1870.

Received from Hurd & Houghton too late for examination. We do not know what this queer book would be at; but as it is by Gail Hamilton, we have not the least doubt that it is a piece of mischief.

Periodicals.

The Southern Methodist Press.

We, some years since, read a passage of a speech by the celebrated Edmund Burke against La Fayette, whom he abhorred, to this

effect: "His conduct toward us during our American war I can overlook; *otherwise war would be perpetual.*" And David, we know, pronounced death upon the man who *shed the blood of war in time of peace.* More fierce than the Hebrew warrior, less humane than the British Statesman, Bishop Marvin of the Church South indorses a book, published in Missouri, that rakes up in the most bitter style the ravages of civil war, saying, "I have met some who say, 'Let the past sleep; let all crimes, and the bad blood engendered by them, be buried for ever.' I have not so learned Christ." Bishop Marvin appears well qualified for the position of Chaplain General for the Ku-Klux. While they assassinate he can preach to match. President Grant is reported as about to send troops into Tennessee to suppress their outrages; but we doubt whether there is a guiltier foe to public peace, or a truer assassin in spirit, in all their hordes, than this same Bishop Marvin. No thanks to men like him if war be not perpetual.

But nearly the entire Southern Methodist press has been pitched to nearly the same key-note ever since the proposal of reunion made at St. Louis by our Bishops. The response of the Southern Bishops has given the cue, and the Editors seem to write under a concerted panic lest their people should listen to the voice of Christian peace. They rail at "that notorious Commission;" attribute all proposals of reunion to "greed," to "love of our property." The fact that proposals came from our Bishops previous to the next General Conference is treated as "struggling for a position," that is, as seeking for a recognition by the Church South while avoiding a manly self-committal by our General Conference to a proposal liable to rejection. Our own statement of the advantages of a nation-wide circulation of ministry is treated as a desire to get possession of the best Southern charges, with an assurance that Southern preachers want not to preach to radical congregations. We cannot recall, in our entire reading of the Southern papers since the first year after the rebellion, either one hearty realization of the blessedness of an undivided nationality, or one cordial wish for either reunion or fraternization of the two Methodisms. The only ultimatum from that side now is, that nothing will be accepted but a square proposition from our General Conference. And we are obliged to add that this ultimatum is propounded in so uninviting, exacting, and dictatorial a style, accompanied by such displays of utter hate and hatefulness, that until a change for the better takes place, self-respect forbids our uttering a syllable farther of either *reunion* or *fraternization.*

Until that change, we dismiss both words from our vocabulary. For this permanence of the bitter and divisive spirit they, not we, are responsible, and boldly and intentionaly responsible. If feud be ceaseless, and war return with returning Southern strength, the leaders of the Church South will bear a prime responsibility. Nor is there a doubt that the true sub-soil to all their hate is political. The Church South is being based on the old rebel stratum, is becoming intrenched in the old sectional prejudice that bred the war. Says the rebel General Hill, quoted in the (Methodist) Nashville "Home Journal," "We confess a warm feeling for our Methodist brethren. They made such splendid rebels! How grandly their soldiers fought, and how earnestly their chaplains prayed! We knew the latter class full well, and among them the venerable and kindly face of the Rev. J. B. M'Ferrin looms up."

We repeat that the whole force of our Church should, in view of this fierce spirit, and in behalf of national peace, unity, and safety, be gathered into the great work of diffusing Southern education, to planting schools, Churches, and periodicals, and to spreading an unsectional Methodism over the South. And this in no hostility to any Southern Church, but with perfect readiness, rather, to unite in sympathy with any Southerners who exhibit the spirit of Christ, and even to encourage them to a similar nationalization by diffusion over the North.

Pamphlets.

Third Annual Report of the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Cincinnati: Western Methodist Book Concern. 8vo., pp. 20. 1869.

First in importance among our missionary fields is the colored South. As Bishop Thomson beautifully remarks in his anniversary speech, the guilt of the North in her maintenance of slavery requires her not to leave the burden of the freedman's education exclusively upon the South. It is the duty of the North to carry on this work in a truly Christian spirit toward all concerned, and to co-operate as fraternally as possible, with all other laborers in the same field. Our object should be to benefit the freedman first, and then all other public interests, both South and North, religious and educational. Rightly conducted, their success would not tend to the disintegration of any great Protestant denomination, but to the increased success and moral strength of all. All hostility between different co-laborers arises, we believe, for want of a sufficient degree of the true spirit of Christ.

The education of the Colored South is a matter of vital national interest. The negro is to be a voter, and it behooves all parties upon whose destinies his vote will tell to see that he gives an intelligent vote. The true course is not his disfranchisement, but his education. Give the people all the intelligence possible, and then all the power possible.

The report furnishes, on the whole, a very favorable view. The good already done is great; the good yet to be done is immeasurable.

Miscellaneous.

Health by Good Living. By W. W. Hall, M. D., Editor of Hall's Journal of Health. 12mo., pp. 277. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1870.

One of the many manual guides to health and long life by right living. They are the efforts of high civilization, to prevent and repair the evils to man's physical system which high civilization produces.

Life of James Hamilton, D. D., F. L. S. By William Arnot. 12mo., pp. 600. Edinburgh, Second Edition. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Memoir of the Rev. William C. Burns, M. A. Missionary to China from the English Presbyterian Church. By the Rev. Islay C. Burns, D. D., Professor of Theology in Free Church College, Glasgow. 12mo., pp. 595. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1870.

We receive these two noble Scotchmen from the Carters too late to do them justice. The one the great preacher and writer, the other the missionary, they were men of shining mark.

Household Stories. From the German of Madame Ottilie Wildermuth. By Eleanor Kimmont. Series 1. Blue and gilt. Illustrated. 16mo., pp. 307. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

A beautiful series of witching German legends.

The Ministry in Galilee. By Rev. William Hanna. 12mo., pp. 360. New York: Carter & Brothers.

One of the series of Dr. Hanna's able Biography of Jesus.

Home Life: How to make Home Happy. Five Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 205. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

The Questions of the Hour: The Bible and the School Fund. By Rufus W. Clark, D. D. 24mo., pp. 126. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Popular Library for Young People. In paper box. Stories of Old England. The Hero of Brittany, History of the Crusades, Count Ulrich of Lindberg. Red and gilt. Illustrations. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

Agnes Morton's Trial, and the Young Governess. By Mrs. Emma N. Janvier. Red and gilt. 16mo., pp. 280. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

Froude's History of England. Vols. XI and XII. Pp. 702, 703. Scribner & Co.

Removing Mountains. Life Lessons from the Gospels. By John S. Hart. 16mo., pp. 306. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Jesus on the Throne of his Father David; or, The Tabernacle of David. When will it be Built again? A Sequel to "The Promise of Shiloh." By JOSEPH L. LORD, M.A., of the Boston Bar. 16mo., pp. 92. New York: James Inglis & Co.

Letter and Spirit: Winchester Lectures. By RICHARD METCALF. 16mo., pp. 186. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1870.

The Spirit of Life; or, Scripture Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost. By E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead. Author of "Yesterday, To-day, and Forever." Pp. 192. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Flowers and Fossils, and Other Poems. By JOHN K. STAYMAN, Professor of Ancient Languages and Classical Literature in Dickinson College. 12mo., pp. 322. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1870.

Anniversary Gems. Consisting of Addresses, Conversations, and Scripture Illustrations for the Sunday-school Concert or Anniversary. By REV. SAMUEL L. GRACEY, Wilmington Conference. 24mo., paper, pp. 215. Philadelphia. Perkinpine & Higgins.

The Unkind Word, and Other Stories. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 418. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The "B. O. W. C." A Book for Boys. By the Author of "The Dodge Club," etc. Illustrated. 16mo., pp. 321. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

Under Foot. A Novel. By ANTON CLYDE, Author of "Maggie Lynne." Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 134. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The Wonders of Pompeii. By MARC MOUNIER. Translated from the Original French. 16mo., pp. 250. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Adventures of Caleb Williams. By WILLIAM GODWIN, Esq., Author of "St. Leon." "Cloudesley," etc. Complete in One Volume. 18mo., pp. 231. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Only Herself. A Novel. By ANNIE THOMAS, (Mrs. Pender Cudlip.) Author of "False Colors," "Dennis Donne," etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 139. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Kitty. By M. BETHAM EDWARDS, Author of "Doctor Jacob," etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 143. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Hirell. A Novel. By the Author of "Abel Drake's Wife," "Martin Pole," etc. 8vo., pp. 157. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The Poetical Works of Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate. Numerous Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 232. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Vick's Illustrated Catalogue and Floral Guide, for 1870. 8vo., pp. 84.

Baptism: Its Subject and Mode. In Two Parts. By Rev. M. TRAFTON, A.M. Second Edition. 24mo., pp. 91. Boston: J. P. Magee. 1870.

Light and Truth; or, Bible Thoughts and Themes. The Acts and the Larger Epistles. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. 12mo., pp. 414. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

The History of Rome. By THEODORE MOMMSEN. Translated, with the Author's sanction and Additions, by the Rev. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow. With a Preface by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ. New Edition in Four Volumes. Volume II. 12mo., pp. 568. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1857.

Journal of a Visit to Egypt, Constantinople, The Crimea, Greece, etc., in the Suite of the Prince and Princess of Wales. By the Hon. Mrs. WILLIAM GREY. 12mo., pp. 209. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Expository Thoughts on the Gospels. For Family and Private Use. By Rev. J. C. RYLE. B. A. St. John, Vol. II. 12mo., pp. 382. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1870.

The Tone Masters. A Musical Series for Young People. Mozart and Mendelssohn. Illustrated. By E. TOURJEE. Red and gilt. 24mo., pp. 193. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

The Odes and Epodes of Horace. A Metrical Translation into English. With Introduction and Commentaries. By Lord LYTTON. With Latin Text from the Editions of Orelli, Mac Leane, and Yonge. 12mo., pp. 520. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Brake Up; or, The Young Peace-makers. By OLIVER OPTIC. Red and gilt. 24mo., pp. 303. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Topics for Teachers. By JAMES C. GRAY. Vol. II, Art. — Religion. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

Dialogues from Dickens. Arranged by W. ELLIOT FETTE, A. M. Green and gilt. 24mo., pp. 260. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

Department of Public Instruction, City of Chicago. Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education, for the Year ending July 3, 1869. 8vo., pp. 318. Chicago: Church, Goodman, & Donnelly. 1869.

The Life of Mary Russell Mitford, Authoress of "Our Village," etc. Told by Herself in Letters to her Friends. Edited by the REV. A. G. K. L'ESTRANGE. In two volumes. 12mo., pp. 378, 365. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The Four Gospels. Translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf. With the Various Readings of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Meyer, Alford, and others; and with Critical and Expository Notes. By NATHANIEL S. FOLSOM. 12mo., pp. 476. Boston: A. Williams & Co. 1869.

Some of the Methods and Results of Observation of the Total Eclipse of the Sun, August 7, 7, 1869. By PROF. CHARLES F. HIMES, Ph. D., Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. Reprinted from the Evangelical Quarterly Review. 12mo., pp. 15. Gettysburgh: J. E. Wible. 1869.

THE RELIEF MAP OF PALESTINE is a beautiful method of presenting the surface of the Holy Land to the eye. It is remarkable that in the Greek Testament the word *mountain* has so frequently the article *the* before it that a skeptic remarked that there was but *one mountain* in the book. To this Ebrard spicily replies that Palestine is but *one mountain* cut by vales. This mountain-character is strikingly visible in the Relief Map.

In order to make the map cheap for all, it is sold *direct*, and not through intermediate agencies. Send one dollar to Rev. W. L. Gage, Hartford, Conn., and when you receive it, you will wonder at its cheapness.

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS.

1. FROM the large number of articles usually in hand, and from the necessity of making up a proper *round* of topics in each number, a writer cannot usually expect that his production can be published in an ensuing number. The Editor must be left at liberty to time the articles as will best suit the purposes of the periodical. 2. An article of over twenty-five pages will rarely be inserted. Each writer should assume beforehand that such is the rule for him. 3. Articles are liable only to the postage of book-manuscript.

Methodist Quarterly Review.

JULY, 1870.

Art. I.—MOMMSEN'S HISTORY OF ROME.

The History of Rome. By Theodor Mommsen. Translated by the Rev. William P. Dickson, D.D. With a Preface by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz. In four volumes. American edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869, 1870.

It is certainly one of the most striking and paradoxical phenomena attending the history of the human race, that its record in much, if not the greater part, of its extent should need to be re-examined and rewritten. The statements of contemporaries, or of those who lived much nearer to the events they chronicle than we do, might naturally be supposed to be entitled to be accepted as final. The historical criticism of the present skeptical age is, however, little inclined to such passive acquiescence, and there is no small weight in the arguments which are advanced at least in behalf of a free discussion of the grounds upon which the legends of the ancient world repose. Even the value of the authority of a contemporary may be largely overrated. Undoubtedly, if he holds the pen of a ready and lively writer, while his eye is quick to discern, and his apprehension to lay hold of the salient points in the events that take place in his immediate vicinity, he may give us a picture of unsurpassed brilliancy and distinctness; but it must, almost of necessity, be contracted to a comparatively narrow field. In the battle of life few, if any, are so admirably posted as to be able to obtain a wide and well-proportioned view of all its leading features. In fact, the result of a comparison of different

contemporary writers is frequently as bewildering as the attempt to reconcile different accounts of a single military engagement, and to extract a consistent narrative from them. Personal prepossessions and prejudices, constitutional peculiarities, varieties of experience, unequal opportunities of observation, and many other circumstances, lead to consequent discrepancies of statement for which the unskilled or cynical critic can find no means of accounting save upon the foolish and uncharitable supposition of willful misrepresentation. The prospect even of the prime actors is far from being uninterrupted, and it is reserved for a subsequent age to rise above the mists of party passion and sectional jealousy, and gain a panoramic view of the wide-extended ground.

It is a still greater mistake to give to writers who lived comparatively near the time of the occurrences they describe implicit faith because of this circumstance, for it not unfrequently happens that a cultivated and intelligent investigator, far removed both in time and place, will avoid the mistakes into which the ignorance and credulity of his predecessors have fallen, while his means of obtaining positive information may be equal, if not superior. After a certain distance has been reached, it becomes a matter of comparative insignificance whether the interval is measured by decades or by hundreds of years.

Yet it must be admitted that criticism, when employed as a means of extracting truth from history that borders upon legend, is a dangerous instrument. Probability, resting, as it does, upon so many and obscure particulars, is always an uncertain, often a treacherous, touchstone. Reasoning from what would be likely to happen is undeniably as unsatisfactory a method of investigating the past, as of prophecy respecting the future. We need not go back to a former age to find ourselves plunged in perplexing incongruities; the history of the day furnishes us with an ample fund, and destructive criticism could perhaps discover quite as many reasons for "Historical Doubts" respecting the existence and achievements of the third Napoleon as concerning those of the first.

We are in a singularly unfortunate situation as respects the early history of that State which, after Palestine and Greece, is undoubtedly the most interesting and important of antiquity. Of the history of Rome under the kings, and for a considerable

period after their expulsion, the learned Niebuhr and his school have made short work. With a single dash of the pen three centuries of the records of the imperial city were obliterated, and every thing before 450 or 500 B. C. became an empty void. Nor were there wanting plausible reasons for this wholesale slaughter of popular traditions. The incredible character of some of the incidents, the large admixture of the supernatural, the poetical tinge given to the entire narrative, all conspired to render it suspicious; and the arguments of the skeptics were supported by an array of such undeniably thorough scholarship that the favorable verdict of the literary world was carried as by storm. Yet it would be contrary to fact to allege that the victory so brilliantly won has remained undisputed. The fatal consequences of pushing the theory of Niebuhr to its legitimate conclusions soon became evident in the depreciation of the value of human testimony in comparison with the deductions of the speculative philosopher. The denial of all truth in the legends respecting the history of an important city for a long period, (all of it subsequent to the era of the Olympiads,) unaccompanied by the substitution of any positive record in their place, was too sweeping to leave the world fully satisfied, and there has consequently been a reaction too marked to be altogether slighted.

Dr. Mommsen is a follower of Niebuhr, and we must not look in his work for any higher appreciation of the legendary history of Rome. Indeed, he takes for granted the truth of the main result at which his great predecessor arrived, and does not undertake to prove its untrustworthiness. While we cannot condemn him for this, we are compelled to regard it as a defect in his treatment of his theme that he does not even deign to give the familiar legends a place, but mars the completeness of his work by rendering his reader dependent on his previous knowledge for all which has passed current for the story of the regal period. Aside from this lack, we welcome this work, for the first time rendered accessible to the American public, as a very valuable and timely addition to our gradually increasing circle of histories truly deserving the name. The remarkable attainments and natural endowments of the author qualify him to cope successfully with a difficult subject. To a profound acquaintance with the language of Rome, and a prolonged

study of the classical authors who have treated of its varied fortunes, Dr. Mommsen adds a rare mastery of the antiquities of Italy, and especially of that source of accurate knowledge—so full, and yet until recently so neglected—the inscriptions. In this department of research he has at the present day scarcely a rival. He crowns these advantages with the scarcely less important requisites of a felicitous method and skill in the effective statement of events, and of a style animated and entertaining, never tame and monotonous, always forcible, and at times strikingly graphic and picturesque. "The reader may, perhaps," says Dr. Dickson in his prefatory note, "be startled by the occurrence now and then of expressions more familiar and colloquial than is usually the case in historical works. This, however, is a characteristic feature in the original to which, in fact, it owes not a little of its charm." It is only justice to state that the translator has done his work exceedingly well, and that comparatively few places will be found in which any awkwardness of expression or foreign idiom betrays the fact that the work was written in another language. This is a commendation rarely deserved by translations, especially from a tongue so different in its genius from our own. At the same time it must be confessed that in a few instances Dr. Dickson has allowed himself to employ such strange forms as *custodier* for *custodian*, and that he has too frequently made use of terms with which the ordinary English reader could scarcely be expected to be familiar. The fault is common to Grote and other historians, but it is none the less a fault. The words *hegemony*, (title of chapter vii, and elsewhere,) *symmachy*, (vol. i, p. 513, etc.,) and *Diadochi*, (vol. i, p. 497, etc.,) are among the less conspicuous instances. We confess that we are unable to see any sufficient reason why our own word *leadership* would not have answered sufficiently well for the first, and *alliance* for the second; while, if the third had been rendered by the words *successors of Alexander the Great*, or simply by its exact equivalent, *successors*, the translation would have been quite as elegant, while more than one poor reader who could boast of no acquaintance with Donnegan, or Liddell and Scott, might have been spared some unnecessary perplexity. And yet we repeat our great satisfaction that this important historical work should have met with a translator so thoroughly a master of the Ger-

man original, and at the same time so ready in his command of his native tongue.

Taking a wider range for his work than the majority of his predecessors, Dr. Mommsen sets out with the intention to relate the history of Italy, not simply the history of the city of Rome. To use his own words:

> Although, in the formal sense of political law, it was the civic community of Rome which gained the sovereignty first of Italy, and then of the world, such a view cannot be held to express the higher and real meaning of history. What has been called the subjugation of Italy by the Romans appears rather, when viewed in its true light, as the consolidation into an united state of the whole Italian stock—a stock of which the Romans were doubtless the most powerful branch, but still were a branch only.*

In consonance with this notion of his task, Dr. Mommsen devotes considerable space in his first volume—in a scientific point of view perhaps the most important of the four—to the origin and relationships, and the early fortunes of the primitive races. Italy, he remarks, with its physical structure giving it an "outlook" to the westward, in marked contrast to that of Greece, which is no less distinctly to the east, and so prefiguring its destiny, possesses no traces of earlier or savage inhabitants. There are no fragments of supplanted nations, no mounds disclosing human skeletons of a strange formation, nothing "to warrant the supposition that mankind existed in Italy at a period anterior to the knowledge of agriculture, and of the smelting of the metals."† Three stocks peopled the entire peninsula: the Italian, of which the Latin was one branch, the Umbri, Marsi, Volsci, and Samnites the other, the Etruscans and the Japygians. Says Dr. Mommsen:

> To establish the national individuality of these is the first aim of our inquiry. In such an inquiry, had we nothing to fall back upon but the chaotic mass of names of tribes, and the confusion of what professes to be historical tradition, the task might well be abandoned as hopeless. The conventionally-received tradition, which assumes the name of history, is composed of a few serviceable notices by civilized travelers, and a mass of mostly worthless legends, which have usually been combined with little discrimination of the true character either of legend or history. But there is another source of tradition to which we may resort, and which yields information fragmentary but authentic; we mean the indig-

* History of Rome, vol. i, p. 27. † Ibid., vol. i, p. 30.

enous languages of the stocks settled in Italy from time immemorial. These languages, which have grown with the growth of the peoples themselves, have had the stamp of their process of growth impressed upon them too deeply to be wholly effaced by subsequent civilization. One only of the Italian languages is known to us completely; but the remains which have been preserved of several of the others are sufficient to afford a basis for historical inquiry regarding the existence, and the degrees, of family relationship among the several languages and peoples.*

Starting with the principle as established, that none of the earliest migrations took place by water, Dr. Mommsen maintains that the Italian race in both its branches reached its central position in the peninsula from the north, and not by crossing the narrow strait at Brundusium. Linguistic comparison confirming the common impression of the close relationship between the Italian and the Greek, who, to use his own expression, are brothers, while the Celt, the German, and the Slavonian are their cousins, he arrives at the following conclusion: that from the common cradle of peoples and languages there issued a stock which embraced in common the ancestors both of the Romans and the Hellenes, and that at a subsequent date, but long prior to their entry into the Mediterranean peninsulas, the Italians branched off from the common stock. In the complete absence of such authentic records as might fix even proximately the chronology of this separation of the Greek and the Italian from the other members of the Indo-Germanic race, all that can now be done is to attempt to gain a general notion of the degree of civilization which their common progenitors had at that time attained. And here language becomes a valuable, and indeed the only, assistant. The Greek and the Latin languages, as well as the Sanscrit, have names evidently derived from the same original for the domestic animals—the ox, the sheep, the horse, the swine, the dog, and even the goose. "Even at this remote period accordingly the stock, on which, from the days of Homer down to our own time, the intellectual development of mankind has been dependent, had already advanced beyond the lowest state of civilization, the hunting and fishing epoch, and had attained at least comparative fixity of abode." † It is otherwise with agriculture; for the diversity of the appellations

* Mommsen, vol. i. pp. 30, 31. † Ibid., vol. i, p. 38.

which the various kinds of grain receive, though not a conclusive proof, is yet an item of negative evidence. At least it seems probable that, if practiced at all, agriculture played a very subordinate part in the economy of that early undivided race, making but a slight impression upon the tongue it spoke. On the other hand, the Græco-Italians were acquainted with the cultivation not only of grain, but probably also of the vine. The names of the operations, as well as the implements of agriculture, are to a considerable extent the same; and if we must, as seems probable, reject as utterly inadmissible the old tradition that agriculture, as well as writing and coinage, first came to Italy by means of the Hellenes, this identity of nomenclature attests the existence of an ancient intercourse of a very close character.

It would thus appear that the transition from pastoral life to agriculture, or, to speak more correctly, the combination of agriculture with the earlier pastoral economy, must have taken place after the Indians had departed from the common cradle of the nation, but before the Hellenes and Italians dissolved their ancient communion. Moreover, at the time when agriculture originated, the Hellenes and Italians appear to have been united as one national whole not merely with each other, but with other members of the great family; at least it is a fact that the most important of those terms of cultivation, while they are foreign to the Asiatic members of the Indo-Germanic family, are used by the Romans and Greeks in common with the Celtic, as well as the Germanic, Slavonic, and Lithuanian stocks.*

Or as the results of the investigation are elsewhere expressed:

Thus, in the language and manners of Greeks and Italians, all that relates to the material foundations of human life may be traced back to the same primary elements; the oldest problems which the world proposes to man had been jointly solved by the two peoples at a time when they still formed one nation.†

The question whether Latium was in ancient times as unhealthy a district as at present has often been mooted, and is answered by Dr. Mommsen in the affirmative. Latium proper, the "plain," deriving its name from *lătus*, (side,) or πλατύς, (flat,) and in no way from *lātus*, (wide,) as the quantity of the first syllable indicates, was a district about as large as

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 43. † Ibid., vol. i, p. 47.

the canton of Zurich. The deep fissures alternating with the tufa hills give rise to lakes, full in the winter season; and the exhalations from these sheets of water, often charged with a large quantity of decaying vegetable matter, are the causes of the well-known fevers of the *Campagna*. Says Dr. Mommsen:

It is a mistake to suppose that these miasmata were first occasioned by the neglect of cultivation, which was the result of misgovernment in the last century of the Republic and is so still. Their cause lies rather in the want of natural outlets for the water, and it operates now as it operated thousands of years ago. It is true, however, that the malaria may, to a certain extent, be banished by thoroughness of tillage—a fact which has not yet received its full explanation, but may be partly accounted for by the circumstance that the working of the surface accelerates the drying up of the stagnant waters.

The difficulty consequently remains of accounting for the fact that a large rural population at one time was able to live in a region so tainted with deadly fevers that no one can reside there with impunity. The historian seeks to meet it by suggesting that man in a lower stage of civilization has an instinctive perception of what nature demands, and a constitution more pliant and elastic.

In Sardinia agriculture is prosecuted under physical conditions precisely similar even at the present day; the pestilential atmosphere exists, but the peasant avoids its injurious effects by caution in reference to clothing, food, and the choice of his hours of labor. In fact, nothing is so certain a protection against the *aria cattiva* as wearing the fleece of animals and keeping a blazing fire; which explains why the Roman countryman went constantly clothed in heavy woolen stuffs, and never allowed the fire on his hearth to be extinguished.*

That under a more equal and favorable tenure of land even so unhealthy a tract of land as the modern Campagna might become well cultivated, populous, and prosperous, may be proved beyond a doubt from the parallel instance of the district of Limagne, in the volcanic district of Auvergne, where, with similar physical disadvantages, under a system of extreme subdivision of the proprietorship of the soil, the dense population of twenty-five hundred souls to the square league, or over three hundred to the square mile, is sustained.† In other words,

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 61.

† Dureau de la Malle, vol. ii, p. 226, *apud* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 62.

this purely rural district is relatively as populous as Belgium with its large manufacturing cities—a kingdom which ranks as the most densely peopled country of Europe. To ruin all this prosperity, as Dr. Mommsen remarks, it would only be necessary to divide the land among six or seven large holders, and to introduce stewards and day laborers in place of the small proprietors. Thus destroying the incentive to manly exertion, "in a hundred years the Limagne would doubtless be as waste, forsaken, and miserable as the Campagna di Roma is at the present day." *

The fortunes of the Greek colonies early founded on the lower coasts of Italy constitute, according to Dr. Mommsen's view, an important part of the history he has undertaken to write. In this connection it is interesting to notice the extent to which the chronological order of their settlement, and their derivation, are fixed by the monetary standards which they adopted, and, for the most part, retained in their coinage.

The Phocæan settlers coined according to the Babylonian standard which prevailed in Asia. The Chalcidian towns followed in the earliest times the Æginetan; in other words, that which originally prevailed throughout all European Greece, and more especially the modification of it which is found occurring in Eubœa. The Achæan communities coined by the Corinthian standard; and, lastly, the Doric colonies followed that which Solon introduced in Attica in the year of Rome 160, with the exception of Tarentum and Heraclea, which, in their principal pieces, adopted rather the standard of their Achæan neighbors than that of the Dorians in Sicily.†

By no means the least valuable parts of this history of Rome are those which are devoted to the discussion of its progress in the arts of life, in law and justice, in religion, in architecture, sculpture, and painting. It is indeed here, and especially in his valuable chapter on the art of writing, that Dr. Mommsen's uncommonly profound researches in the monumental records of Italy come particularly into play.

We quote some of his remarks respecting the introduction of the alphabetic characters into Italy, especially as regards Latium and Etruria.

This Aramæo-Hellenic alphabet was accordingly brought to the Italians through the medium of the Sicilian or Italian Hellenes;

* Mommsen, *ubi supra.* † Ibid., vol. i, p. 181.

not, however, through the agricultural colonies of Magna Græcia, but through the merchants of Cumæ or Naxos, by whom it must have been brought in the first instance to the very ancient emporia of international traffic in Latium and Etruria—to Rome and Cære. The alphabet received by the Italians was by no means the oldest Hellenic one; it had already experienced several modifications, particularly the addition of the three letters $\xi\,\phi\,\chi$, and the alteration of the signs for $\iota\,\gamma\,\lambda$. We have already observed that the Etruscan and Latin alphabets were not derived the one from the other, but both directly from the Greek; in fact, the Greek alphabet came to Etruria in a form materially different from that which reached Latium. The Etruscan alphabet has a double sigma *s* (sigma *s* and san *sh*) and only one *k*, and of the *r* only the older form *P;* the Latin has, so far as we know, only a single *s*, but a double sign for *k*, (kappa *k* and koppa *q*) and of the *r* merely the more recent form *R*. The oldest Etruscan writing shows no knowledge of lines, and winds like the coiling of a snake; the more recent employs parallel broken off lines from right to left; the Latin writing, as far as our monuments reach back, exhibits only the latter form of parallel lines, which originally, perhaps, may have run at pleasure from left to right or from right to left, but subsequently ran among the Romans in the former, and among the Faliscans in the latter direction.*

Admitting that the Latin alphabet bears on the whole a more recent character than the Etruscan, Dr. Mommsen does not receive this as sufficient proof of the statement that writing was practiced earlier in Etruria than in Rome. The Etruscans seem to have received the alphabet from Greece once for all; while the Romans, in consequence of their close and continued intercourse with Magna Græcia, kept pace with all its successive improvements, and adopted not a few of the most important. More interesting, however, than the mere question of the form or derivation of the Roman alphabet, is that which respects the antiquity of the art of writing. And it is curious to find the tendency of all recent investigation toward the establishment of the fact that, so far from being a comparatively recent invention at the time when the first extant historical works, or other works to whose composition a definite date can be assigned, were committed to parchment or papyrus, this mother of all the arts of life must be referred far back of the commonly accepted age of Homer—the ninth century before the Christian era. Thus it is that the pendulum of scientific

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 281, and following.

investigation in its violent oscillations seems to vibrate between the farthest extremes. With the idea that alphabetic writing was but little known or employed in Greece before the rule of Pisistratus in Athens, the plausible theory that the Iliad and the Odyssey were originally a series of ballads of early minstrels clumsily united in single epics by subsequent compilers also falls to the ground. The supposition that the immortal epopees were the result of successive additions to original poems of much smaller dimensions is likewise overturned by the removal of that which has hitherto been regarded as its chief prop; and that destructive criticism which, with little regard to the true tokens of internal unity and historical consistency, or to the value of the strongest testimony, recklessly attacks the integrity of productions sacred and profane, and as rashly seeks to find the *nucleus* of the prophecy of Isaiah or of Ezekiel, as of the Iliad or of Hesiod's Works and Days, receives signal discomfiture.

How early the Italians of Latium were acquainted with the use of alphabetic writing is, therefore, a question of more importance than it would at first sight seem to be. For, whatever date we may assign to the first use of the alphabet in the vicinity of Rome, we are compelled to admit a considerably greater antiquity to its introduction to the peninsula at Cumæ and in Campania, and a much more remote period for the origination of the improvements in the primitive characters introduced from Phœnicia into the Greek mother country.

Dr. Mommsen does not attempt to fix the date of the introduction of the alphabet into Middle Italy with any degree of precision, but merely to exhibit the fact that it must have been far earlier than the beginning of the commonwealth.

While the Etruscans thus appear as the instruments in diffusing the alphabet in the north, east, and south of the peninsula, the Latin alphabet again was confined to Latium, and maintained its ground, upon the whole, there, with but few alterations; only the letters γ κ and ζ σ gradually became coincident in sound, the consequence of which was, that in each case one of the homophonous signs (κ ζ) disappeared from writing. In Rome it can be shown that these were already laid aside when the Twelve Tables were committed to writing. Now, when we consider that in the oldest abbreviations the distinction between γ *c* and κ *k* is

still regularly maintained;* that the period, accordingly, when the sounds became in pronunciation coincident, and before that again the period during which the abbreviations became fixed, were far earlier than the origin of the Twelve Tables; and lastly, that a considerable interval must necessarily have elapsed between the introduction of writing and the establishment of a conventional system of abbreviation; we must, both as regards Etruria and Latium, carry back the commencement of the art of writing to an epoch which more closely approximates to the first incidence of the Egyptian Sirius-period within historical times, the year 1322 B. C., than to the year 776, with which the chronology of the Olympiads began in Greece.†

Dr. Mommsen adds in a foot-note,

If this view is correct, the origin of the Homeric poems (though of course not exactly in the form in which we now have them) must have been far anterior to the age which Herodotus assigns for the flourishing of Homer, (100 before Rome, B. C. 850;) for the introduction of intercourse at all, between Hellas and Italy, belongs only to the post-Homeric period.

But independently of the indirect proofs afforded by the alphabet itself, our author maintains the antiquity of the art of writing as derived from other indications.

The existence of documents of the regal period is sufficiently attested; such was the special treaty between Rome and Gabii, which was concluded by a King Tarquinius, and probably not by the last of that name, and which, written on the skin of the bullock sacrificed on the occasion, was preserved in the Temple of Sancus on the Quirinal, which was rich in antiquities, and probably escaped the conflagration of the Gauls. . . . When Roman tradition speaks of halls in the forum, where the boys and girls of quality were taught to read and write as early as the time of the expulsion of the Kings, the statement may be, but is not necessarily to be deemed, an invention. We have been deprived of information as to the early Roman history, not in consequence of a want of a knowledge of writing, or even perhaps of the lack of documents, but in consequence of the incapacity of the historians of the succeeding age, which was called to investigate the history, to work out the materials furnished by the archives, and of the perversity which led them to ransack tradition for the delineation of motives and of characters, for accounts of battles and narratives of revolutions, and in pursuit of these to miss such information as it would not have refused to yield to the serious and self-denying inquirer.‡

* Thus *C* represents *Gaius; C N, Gnœus;* while *K* stands for *Kæso.*

† Mommsen, vol. i, p. 286.

‡ Ibid., vol. i, p. 288.

In his first volume Dr. Mommsen traces the change of the polity of the Roman State from that original form which he compares to a modern constitutional monarchy inverted—the King having the powers of the people of England, the people that ultimate sovereignty which the King of England theoretically possesses—to the aristocratical form of government in which the Senate became almost omnipotent by the absorption of powers belonging to the Kings which the Consuls were not permitted to inherit, and of the right of appeal, which fell more and more into desuetude. At the same time he delineates the growth of the State externally, until its dominion was extended over the entire Italian peninsula. The successive defeats of the Gauls in the fourth century before the Christian era had for their chief result to prove to the Romans themselves, as well as to the neighboring Italian States, that they were the bulwark of peninsular civilization against the hordes of barbarians which again and again precipitated themselves upon the southern shores of Europe, and threatened to exterminate the growth of culture on the narrow strip of land where it had just taken root. And it was this view, according to the historian, that tended more than is usually supposed to further the subsequent claims of the Romans to universal empire.* But the intervention of Pyrrhus furnished the excuse, or rather first suggested the necessity of passing the bounds which the ambition of the Senate had up to this time always set for itself. Italy was well consolidated. The Gauls *destroyed*, but never *founded* States. Unlike them, and unlike every other people that struggled for the supremacy in Italy, the Romans permanently retained whatever once fell into their hands. Their statesmanship contributed more to their success even than their military discipline and the personal valor of their troops. From the first, *hope* was a prominent element in their constitution. They were rarely cast down. Overwhelming defeats, which would have brought Carthage to instant submission; the overrunning of their territories, which would have rendered others hopeless of success, only stimulated them to greater exertions, to irresistible assaults. It was characteristic of them, that they voted thanks for not having despaired of the republic to generals who had been defeated in consequence of their own

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 431.

rashness, and whom the unforgiving Punic Republic would have punished with death.* It was equally characteristic of them, that their Senate would entertain no negotiations for peace when a defeat had recently been incurred. And after conquering, they assimilated. Their great military roads rendered communication easy with their new acquisitions; their colonies rendered the bands of union firm and indissoluble. They remodeled, somewhat unscrupulously, it must be admitted, the constitutions of the cities and States that fell into their power; exalting the aristocracy and abasing the people, and accordingly bringing the subordinate members of the commonwealth into conformity with the pattern of the Roman city itself. At times they seemed almost to emulate the caprice and ingratitude of the tyrant who, when he conquered cities, made citizens of Syracuse out of the nobles who had opposed him, and sold the unoffending common people into slavery, considering the former a much more manageable element in the State.†

But if the control which Rome undertook to exercise over Italy was despotic, the Roman Senate had the wisdom not to overlook the fact, that the only means of giving permanence to despotism is moderation on the part of the despots. The subject communities were not insulted and injured in the same breath; they were not goaded to desperation by losing not only the substance, but even the very semblance of self-government. They either had the full Roman franchise granted in lieu of independence, or were left in possession of a species of autonomy which included a shadow of independence, a special share in the military and political successes of Rome, and above all a free communal constitution—so far as the Italian confederacy extended, there existed no community of helots.

Was it sagacity, or was it accident, that led Rome to steer clear of the rock upon which similar ambitious States have generally made shipwreck? She made no attempt to tax the Italian States: "With a clear-sightedness and magnanimity perhaps unparalleled in history," the Roman commonwealth

* In B. C. 241 the Carthaginians crucified one of their admirals for a loss far inferior to that of the Romans at Cannæ. Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 70.

† *Νομίσας δῆμον εἶναι συνοίκημα ἀχαριτώτατον.* Herodotus, Book VII, c. 156.

"waived the most dangerous of all the rights of government, the right of taxing her subjects. At the most, tribute was perhaps imposed on the dependent Celtic cantons: so far as the Italian confederacy extended, there was no tributary community." And the third peculiarity of Rome's government over Italy was probably quite as important in conciliating the friendship and securing the submission of the inferior States. The burden of furnishing troops for the continual wars was not rolled off upon them. If they took their part in carrying them on, it was under the leadership of Rome, and with her citizens continually before them as their example. The perils and the glories of war were common to ruling and subject cities, and the spoils were divided between them.*

Meanwhile the Roman State can scarcely be said to have advanced with equal rapidity in other respects. Religion continued to be a simple spiritualizing of earthly objects. So material and degrading were its tendencies, that when silver first came into use as a partial substitute for copper in the currency the new metal was assigned a place in the worship of the country as the god "Argentinus," and he was appropriately made the son of the copper god "Æsculanus." †

Law was unequally developed. While the civil law was gradually being perfected, and a system was being formed that has challenged the admiration of the world, "the criminal procedure was completely void of principle, and was degraded into the sport and instrument of political parties." Art remained rude and undeveloped in Northern Italy. At Rome it was neglected, while in Etruria it remained stationary in its first stage, so that Etruscan art, "the stunted daughter," has long been regarded as "the mother of Hellenic art." ‡ In fact, Rome was obtaining her empire by the payment of no inconsiderable price. "For Nike, too, is followed by her Nemesis. In the Roman Commonwealth there was no special dependence on any one man, either on soldier or on general; and under the rigid discipline of its moral police, all the idiosyncrasies of human character were extinguished. Rome reached a greatness such as no other State of antiquity attained, but she dearly purchased her greatness at the sacrifice of the graceful variety,

* See Mommsen, vol. i, p. 545.

† Ibid., vol. i, pp. 557–58.

‡ Ibid., vol. i, p. 609.

of the easy *abandon,* and of the inward freedom of Hellenic life." *

The story of the first two Carthaginian wars, of the Macedonian wars, and the war against Antiochus the Great, which takes up the second volume, with the exception of the long and very valuable chapters on the government, the agriculture and internal economy, etc., of Rome during the third period furnishes Dr. Mommsen an opportunity for displaying not only his wide range of research, but also his vigorous, lively, and dramatic power of description. The account of Hannibal's invasion of Italy will be read with most interest as recording the most striking incident, perhaps, in the earlier history of the city. It is well executed, and will amply repay a perusal. The failure of the Romans to check the progress of the bold Carthaginian leader is ascribed not only to the strange want of foresight which they evinced, but to the absurdity of attempting to carry on war with a shifting command, "left year after year to be decided by the Pandora box of the balloting urn." † None of the consuls were Hannibal's match. Even the Dictator, Quintus Fabius Maximus,

Unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem,

does not, according to our historian, deserve the praise which a later age especially was in the habit of so lavishly bestowing upon him. "It was not the *Cunctator* that saved Rome, but the compact structure of its confederacy, and not less, perhaps, the national hatred with which the Phœnician hero was regarded by the men of the West." But if Fabius was too prudent to be a model of generalship, certainly his course contrasted so brilliantly with the disasters that befell his master-of-horse and subsequent colleague, Minucius, ‡ and the Consul Varro, that we may be pardoned for lingering with some satisfaction upon the respectable figure of the old warrior.

In spite of the fearful rout and slaughter of Cannæ, Rome

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 581. † Ibid., vol. ii, p. 162.

‡ How much vividness it gives to the history of events which are now nearly twenty-one centuries old to read of the discovery at Rome, near the church of San Lorenzo, in 1862, of the tablet on which Minucius inscribed the dedication he made to Hercules Victor in consequence of the victory at Gerunium, which secured him his unfortunate elevation to the dictatorship—"*Heraclei sacrom M. Minuci(us) C. f dictator vovit.*"—Ibid., vol. ii, p. 152.

did not fall into Carthaginian hands, nor did Hannibal lay siege to it.

He knew Rome better than the simpletons who in ancient and modern times have fancied that he might have terminated the struggle by a march on the enemy's capital. Modern warfare, it is true, decides a war on the field of battle; but in ancient times, when the system of attacking fortresses was far less developed than the system of defense, the most complete success in the field was on numberless occasions neutralized by the resistance of the walls of the capitals. The council and citizens of Carthage were not at all to be compared to the Senate and people of Rome. The peril of Carthage after the first campaign of Regulus was infinitely more imminent than that of Rome after the battle of Cannæ, yet Carthage had made a stand, and been completely victorious. With what color could it be expected that Rome would now deliver her keys to the victor, or even accept an equitable peace?" *

The wisdom of Rome's conduct toward the nations subject to her ceased, according to Dr. Mommsen, when the victorious legions had passed beyond Italy, and laid in Africa and in the East the foundations for a world-empire. It was, of course, in the very nature of things that Rome should insist upon the humiliation of her Phœnician rival. It was her only safety. "The living of different nations side by side in peace and amity upon the whole, although maintaining an attitude of mutual antagonism—which appears to be the aim of the people of modern times—was a thing foreign to antiquity. *In ancient times it was necessary to be either anvil or hammer.*" † But when the safety of Rome had been fully provided for by the terms of the treaty that closed the second Punic war, when Carthage had been reduced from the position of the mistress, politically and commercially, of the western part of the Mediterranean, and a dangerous rival of Rome herself in Sicily and Magna Græcia, to a tributary city of no importance, save in the matter of trade, it was obviously no less the dictate of sound judgment than of humanity to suffer her to retain undisturbed that measure of prosperity which she still enjoyed. It is not difficult to explain the origin of the rancor with which she was still pursued, exhibiting itself in systematic injustice and neglect of every appeal for redress; but the hatred that could be satisfied only by the complete destruction of the city

* Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 168. † Ibid., vol. ii, p. 229.

can be justified on no grounds of morals or policy. It was a crime, and it was a serious blunder.

The tolerant and philhellenic treatment of Greece by Flaminius, and his successors in the administration of eastern affairs, is regarded by Dr. Mommsen to have been no less mistaken, although the failing was akin to virtue. Unfortunately Greece, in the second century before Christ, could not be treated with safety as the Romans, who admired the masterpieces of poetry, of painting, of sculpture, and of architecture which she had produced, were disposed to do. The fruits of centuries of dissension, the natural results of a love of independence pushed to an extravagant extreme, together with other evils which need not here be enumerated, had rendered her unfit to accept the measure of liberty which she desired, and which many at Rome were willing to grant.

The proud impotence of the Achæans, the best of the Greeks of their day, is only too faithfully described in the graphic picture which Dr. Mommsen has given us:

> The Achæans believed it their duty to display the independence of their State all the more the less they really had; they talked of the rights of war, and of the faithful aid of the Achæans in the wars of the Romans; they asked the Roman envoys at the Achæan diet why Rome should concern herself about Messene when Achaia put no questions as to Capua, and the spirited patriot who had thus spoken was applauded, and was sure of votes at the elections. All this would have been very right and very dignified had it not been much more ridiculous. There was a profound justice, and a still more profound melancholy, in the fact that Rome, however earnestly she endeavored to establish the freedom, and to earn the thanks of the Hellenes, yet gave them nothing but anarchy, and reaped nothing but ingratitude. Undoubtedly very generous sentiments lay at the bottom of the Hellenic antipathy to the protecting power, and the personal bravery of some of the men who took the lead in the movement was unquestionable; but this Achæan patriotism remained not the less a folly and a genuine historical caricature. With all that ambition, and all that national susceptibility, the whole nation was, from the highest to the lowest, pervaded by the most thorough sense of impotence. Every one was constantly listening to learn the sentiments of Rome, the liberal man no less than the servile; they thanked heaven when the dreaded decree was not issued; they were sulky when the Senate gave them to understand that they would do well to yield voluntarily in order that they might not need to be compelled; they did what they were obliged to do, if possible, in a way offensive to the Ro-

mans, "to save forms;" they reported, explained, delayed, equivocated, and when all this would no longer avail, yielded with a patriotic sigh. Their proceedings might have claimed indulgence at any rate, if not approval, had their leaders been resolved to fight, and had they preferred the destruction of the nation to its bondage; but neither Philopœmen nor Lycortas thought of any such political suicide—they wished, if possible, to be free, but they wished above all to live. Besides all this, the dreaded intervention of Rome in the internal affairs of Greece was not the arbitrary act of the Romans, but was always invoked by the Greeks themselves, who, like boys, brought down on their own heads the rod which they feared. The reproach repeated *ad nauseam* by the mass of the learned in Hellenic and post Hellenic times—that the Romans strove to stir up internal discord in Greece—is one of the most foolish absurdities which scholars, dealing in politics, have ever invented. It was not the Romans that carried strife to Greece—which in truth would have been "carrying owls to Athens"—but the Greeks that carried their dissensions to Rome.*

Rarely or never does a nation lose its liberties before it has become unworthy to retain them. It was certainly so with Rome. Brutus and his fellow-patriots engaged in the hopeless task of attempting to galvanize a dead body into life again. If Rome—the people, we mean—had been able to govern itself it would have done so. No usurpation could have mastered it, no cunning plotter of tyranny would have succeeded in binding it down: or if he had been able to involve it in his toils in some moment of temporary obliviousness, the nation would have awaked from its sleep, and have broken the feeble cords with a single exertion of its Samson-like strength; but unfortunately, before the master came the people were ready for servitude. It was as impossible to continue a system of self-government, for which the people were no longer capable, as it has been found within our own times to impose it upon the Spanish-American colonies, whose citizens possess neither the education nor the self-control necessary for its exercise, and whose superstition and skepticism equally militate against its permanence.

Political errors mature their fruit slowly for the most part. The inherent vice does not at once reveal its deadly character. To the contemporaries of Socrates it appeared to be absurd, and almost sacrilegious, when he ascribed the corruption of manners and morals in their day to Themistocles, Pericles, and

* Mommsen, vol. ii, pp. 330, 331.

other leaders that flourished in what was regarded as the golden age of the Athenian commonwealth; and it may seem almost as strange to seek for the causes of the degeneracy of the Romans of the Empire in the period of magnificent conquest and unexampled external prosperity which succeeded the war with Hannibal. Yet many of those causes can there be found without difficulty. One of these, to which Dr. Mommsen calls special attention, was the fatal innovation which the vast extension of the Roman territory almost necessarily introduced into the constitution. While Rome confined its authority to Italy it had been possible to maintain somewhat of a semblance of republican equality. Within the limits of the peninsula, with scarcely an exception, every State had either been incorporated into the Roman State or had been received into alliance with it; but when Roman authority crossed the sea there arose tributary States, deprived even of their nominal independence, and governed by their conquerors. Hence arose also the necessity for intrusting Roman citizens, theoretically not a whit superior in rank to their fellows, with almost regal powers. The Roman prætor in Sicily not only resided in the old palace of Hiero at Syracuse,* but succeeded to his powers. In fact, the governor, backed by the overwhelming military force and prestige of his native city, was more formidable to the provincials, whom he ruled with a rod of iron, than the tyrant whom he followed had been. Now this was often, or it seemed to be, the only course that was open to the Romans. They supplanted despotic rulers — the Carthaginians or the Greek kings—and they must govern in like manner in order to be obeyed. They were constrained to model the provincial constitution of Spain after the same pattern. This necessity was "the shirt of Nessus, which they inherited from the enemy." The possession of absolute power, with little or no practical responsibility, not only begot cruelty, and those corrupt and vexatious exactions under which the natives of the provinces writhed, but for which they could rarely obtain redress from the Roman Senate, but it reared a fatal rival to freedom in its very bosom. It was impossible for him who had been a king in every thing but name, and who had enriched himself from the hard-earned property of unresisting Sicilians or Orientals,

* Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 398.

to resume gracefully and contentedly a place beside the poor burgess of Rome, who, because he had never enjoyed such opportunities for plunder, made but a sorry appearance in comparison. No wonder that through the last century of the Republic the seeds of revolution were sown broadcast, and began to bear fruit.

But more disastrous, because more radically destructive to a free government, was the institution of slavery. For, after all, liberty had never been for all, and it became, as time passed, the privilege of the few. In what we call the later Republic, not to speak of the servitude of the extra-Italian peoples, the great majority of the inhabitants of Latium itself were slaves. Of the free population a small proportion consisted of the wealthy and independent capitalists; the rest were the poor and thriftless, for whom the government was compelled to provide cheap corn from abroad, to the ruin of the agricultural classes of Italy. Evidently we have here a republic in no true sense of the word, but rather an oligarchy, in which the power belongs to those who can buy the most votes of the populace.

For centuries the tendency had been uninterrupted toward the destruction of the small farmers of Italy. The lands were gradually swallowed up in the large estates of the very rich. Grain could no longer be cultivated to advantage, nor, indeed, could any thing else by free labor. The wars of the second and third centuries before Christ supplied the slave market abundantly. It is true that the Roman treatment of slave laborers was destructive, and, like other implements of agriculture, they had to be replaced very frequently. But the cold-blooded calculation of the Roman slaveholder had proved to him that it was cheaper to use up the powers of the human machine quickly and thoroughly, and then to throw it away, than to yield to any feeble suggestions of humanity and prudence, and fail to tax the full energies of the servant. And so it became a maxim—we have it from Cato, the model Roman farmer, himself—that a slave must either be sleeping or working; every waking moment must be put to some service, not a moment given to recreation. Even religion must not interpose to relieve him, which in earlier times "had released the slave and the plow-ox from labor on the days enjoined for fes-

tivals and for rest." "Nothing," remarks Dr. Mommsen, "is more characteristic of the spirit of Cato, and those who shared his sentiments, than the way in which they inculcated the observance of the holiday in the letter and evaded it in reality, by advising that, while the plow should certainly be allowed to rest on these days, *the slaves should even then be incessantly occupied with other labors not expressly prohibited.*" * Buying his slaves just at the age when they reached their full powers, and selling them when they became at all too feeble for severe labor, not allowing them more time or food than was requisite for keeping them in working order, debarring them from marriage, and thus relieving himself from the necessity of supporting any unproductive class of subordinates, the Roman slaveholder could underbid the free laborer, who struggled to gain for his family a scanty subsistence, and drove him to beggary.

We must admit that it is difficult to feel much sympathy or regret when such a bastard Republic loses its so-called liberties. We may not feel quite ready to applaud the instrument of their overthrow, but we can scarcely avoid feeling a certain degree of satisfaction that the world is well rid of so barefaced an imposture. Dr. Mommsen goes further, and gives Julius Cæsar credit for more disinterestedness than his readers will perhaps accord to him. "Like every genuine statesman, he served not the people for reward, not even the reward of their love, but sacrificed the favor of his contemporaries for the blessing of posterity, and above all, for the permission to save and renew his nation." † With justice, however, he exalts his sagacity in preferring to make himself the head of the *nation* by a judicious amnesty extended to his enemies rather than retain power as the chief of a party, although by so doing he alienated the "degenerate democracy" by showing them that his objects were by no means coincident with their own, and even his personal adherents, who had hoped to enrich themselves with the spoils of their antagonists. Cæsar, according to our historian, having "the hereditary right to be head of the popular party," and having "for thirty years borne aloft its banner without changing, or even so much as concealing, his colors, remained democrat even when monarch. His

* Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 438. † Ibid., vol. iv, chap. xi.

monarchy was not the oriental despotism of divine right, but a monarchy such as Caius Gracchus wished to found, such as Pericles and Cromwell founded — the representation of the nation by the man in whom it puts supreme and unlimited confidence." *

But Dr. Mommsen is careful to show that if he approves of the work which Cæsar performed it is only because it was, in his opinion, the best thing for Rome under the circumstances; and he protests against a foolish and dishonest application of the lessons of history, which leaves out of view the peculiar features of the various ages. In the true sense, "the history of Cæsar and of Roman Imperialism, with all the unsurpassed greatness of the master worker, with all the historical necessity of the work, is in truth a more bitter censure of modern autocracy than could be written by the hand of man. According to the same law of nature in virtue of which the smallest organism infinitely surpasses the most artistic machine, every constitution, however defective, which gives play to the free self-determination of a majority of citizens, infinitely surpasses the most brilliant and humane absolutism; for the former is capable of development, and therefore living; the latter is what it is, and therefore dead." "Cæsar's work," he adds, "was necessary and salutary, not because it was or could be fraught with blessing in itself, but because—with the national organization of antiquity, which was based on slavery and was utterly a stranger to republican-constitutional representation, and in presence of the legitimate civic constitution, which in the course of five hundred years had ripened into oligarchic absolutism—absolute military monarchy was the copestone logically necessary, and the least of evils."

It may be added that Dr. Mommsen, in the former edition of his last volume, expressed in no ambiguous terms his skepticism respecting the permanence of republican institutions in the Southern States of the American Union, in close association with the legal slavery of a subject race. It is interesting to find that in his last edition he has been led to give utterance, in a note upon this passage, to his hearty sympathy with the cause of freedom, and his joy in its complete triumph.

* Mommsen, *ubi supra.*

When this was written—in the year 1857—no one could foresee how soon the mightiest struggle, and the most glorious victory as yet recorded in human annals, would save the United States from this fearful trial, and secure the future existence of an absolute self-governing freedom not to be permanently kept in check by any local Cæsarianism.

We rise from a perusal of Theodor Mommsen's History of Rome with the conviction that it is a very valuable contribution to our knowledge of the progress and decline of that remarkable commonwealth; exhibiting far more fully and accurately than any other work with which we are acquainted the condition of the masses, their religious faith, their degree of culture, their advance in the arts of life, their literary and social privileges, and, in short, all those elements which go to make up the sum of their happiness or misery. Both in this respect, and in the skillful dramatization of the narrative of the political events, it is by far the most natural and life-like delineation of the ancient Romans. We hope that the author may be permitted to continue it, if not through the history of the Western Empire, at least to the point where Gibbon's great work commences. The American publishers deserve the thanks of the reading public for introducing the work to them in a style, upon the whole, superior to that of the English edition. They are, moreover, entitled to special commendation for appending to the last volume an index to the entire work. Strange as it may seem, the English edition, a part of which has been a number of years before the public, is destitute of one; and in this, we believe, it follows the original German issue. An omission of this kind is certainly scarcely pardonable in any work of permanent value, and intended not for rapid perusal, but for close study, comparison, and consultation. But it is the less excusable when the equally flagrant offense is committed of narrowing down the table of contents to the bare heading of chapters. Our own opinion is, that no labor expended in perfecting the appliances for reference in a historical or scientific work, or even in a book of travels, is thrown away. The admirable arrangement of Prescott's works might well be imitated in all similar cases; in which not only is the alphabetical index exhaustive, but in the extended table prefixed to each volume a separate line is generally given to the subject

of each page. On the other hand the reader of Kirk's Charles the Bold, until the long deferred publication of the third volume, was absolutely without any means of referring to any given topic contained in the first two volumes.

We must, in conclusion, express our regret at the method which Dr. Mommsen has adopted regarding the authorities upon which his history is based. Not that we approve the plan of overburdening the text with a mass of notes, critical and illustrative, so numerous and detailed as to break in upon the continuity of the narrative proper—a fashion not a little in vogue among his own countrymen. But the practice of the modern school of French historians, of omitting all reference to the writers to whom they owe their information, is far more objectionable. Not only is it unfair to the reader, who, after all, is scarcely to be expected to put implicit faith in statements which the historian disdains to support by alleging his grounds, but it is highly demoralizing to the writer himself. It cultivates recklessness of assertion, careless and superficial investigation, inaccurate and unwarranted generalizations; for it relieves the historian of all fear of that immediate detection which is sure to overtake him if he bases his false assertions on garbled quotations. Independently of these considerations, such a method is a positive injury to the progress of scientific investigation. It entails upon subsequent writers the task of beginning again virtually at the same point where their predecessors commenced, and of laying again the same foundations, instead of rearing a superstructure upon the foundations laid by others. The earlier part of Roman history, in particular, treats of so many controverted questions, and turns so much upon the construction that is to be put upon obscure passages, or the credit that must be given to conflicting assertions of classical writers, that no other method but that of constant and ample citation would seem to be appropriate.

Art. II.—AN INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING AND AIM OF MATTHEW XXIV, 1-36.

In order to ascertain the true meaning of our Lord's prophecy in this chapter, the most important point unquestionably is, *the starting point.* And to start right, we must set out from the stand-point of Jesus and his disciples. The disciples, as will appear, regarded both his predictions and their own question from one stand-point, while Jesus regarded them from a point of view entirely different from theirs. Both these facts must enter as elements into the interpretation, in order that we may ascertain the true point of departure.

It will be assumed, at present:

1. That this portion of the discourse was designed, 1) To guard the disciples and their successors against deception, hence that initial, "Take heed;" 2) To introduce suitably the grand theme of the discourse—*the general judgment.*

2. That, with these ends in view, Jesus corrects some of their mistaken ideas concerning the two great coming events in the world's history: 1) The establishment of his mediatorial kingdom on the earth; and, 2) The winding up of that kingdom at his second personal coming "to judge the quick and the dead."

3. That every passage in the discourse is to be construed as relating to the one or the other of these events, according to its obvious meaning rather than its local position.

4. That the seeming confusion of the two events arises mainly from these facts: 1) The two events are carried along side by side through this portion of the discourse, sometimes one being referred to, sometimes the other, so as to make the contrast more apparent, and enable the disciples to discriminate more readily and certainly between them. 2) The transitions from one thought to another, as was common in our Lord's sayings, and as was characteristic of the Aramaic language in which he probably uttered them, were abrupt, leaving the mind of the hearer to supply the connecting thoughts. 3) We have no report of the discourse in the language in which it was spoken, but only a translation of it into a language quite different in its structure and genius. 4. We have no full report of the discourse

in any language, not even by Matthew, but only a pretty full outline; as is evident from a comparison of the three evangelists reporting it.

5. That this mixed portion of the discourse is continued through the thirty-fifth verse, when the former subject is dropped, and the latter carried forward to the end of the twenty-fifth chapter.

It is believed that, bearing these propositions in mind, it will not be difficult to ascertain the meaning and application of every part of the discourse, so that the whole shall appear consistent, harmonious, and adapted to the ends contemplated. We shall not need the theory of double prophecy, though some prophecies may have a double meaning; we shall not need to correct the translation, though in some instances the translation could be very much improved. We shall want a little help, and only a little, from the fragmentary reports of Mark and Luke; and shall find great assistance in ascertaining the stand-point of Jesus and his disciples, by a careful study of what had just before taken place in the temple.

According to this theory of interpreting the discourse, it will appear that the *beginning* and the *ending* of Messiah's kingdom are the two principal subjects considered; that the notions of the disciples concerning these two events were defective, confused, erroneous; that in correcting their dangerous mistakes, our Lord shows that in connection with the first of these events, and for which he had now come, *Jerusalem and Judaism* should perish; but in connection with the second, and for which he would come again, *the world* should be destroyed. And we should remark in passing, that, while the destruction of Jerusalem, and the consequent subversion of Judaism, was by no means the *first* fact in the establishment of Christ's kingdom, it was nevertheless an *essential* fact. It completed the transfer of God's line of operations in subjugating the world from Judaism to Christianity. It was the formal relinquishment of the former, and adoption of the latter in its stead.

It is quite evident, from a comparison of the different reports of the transaction, either that Matthew has misstated the question of the disciples, or that they did not understand the full import of their own inquiry; that Peter, and James, and John,

and Andrew, did not mean all that their words meant. But if we suppose that Matthew gives the question *as they asked it*, and that Mark and Luke give it *as they meant it*, then the statements harmonize. And they harmonize not only with each other, but with Christ's answer also; which answer, upon any other supposition, will be found irrelevant.

1. *What was the question, as the disciples intended it?*

Mark and Luke agree substantially, and Mark's statement of it is this: "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" But according to Matthew, the latter member of the question is in these words: "And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" It appears, then, that the disciples understood Christ's coming and the end of the world, whatever their ideas of those events might be, as part of "*these things*" which Jesus had just predicted; and that all "these things" —second advent and the end of the world included—would be fulfilled in the fulfillment of his prediction.

But it is not at all likely that by "the end of the world" they meant the destruction of this mundane sphere; or, that by "thy coming," they had any idea of his coming, as he applies it, to wind up the affairs of his kingdom by the general judgment. For, 1. They shared fully the prevalent Jewish expectation of a temporal kingdom, or at least a terrestrial kingdom. This expectation they never abandoned until some time after his resurrection, possibly not until the day of Pentecost. 2. They did not understand as literal Christ's predictions of his own death and resurrection. 3. His mysterious utterances in the temple, only a few minutes before, were yet fresh in their minds. They had heard his terrible denunciation of the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees; they had listened to his pathetic lamentation over the doomed city; they had heard him tell the people that he was about to leave them, to return no more until they should be prepared to welcome him back as the expected Messiah; and they had just now heard him predict the utter overthrow of their beautiful temple.

In view of all these considerations, it is probable—almost certain—1. That by "*the end of the world*," (συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος,) the disciples understood and meant the termination of the present order of things, involving the overthrow of all hostile powers,

whether Roman or Jewish, preparatory to the setting up of Messiah's kingdom. 2. That by Christ's predicted *departure* they understood his temporary withdrawal, perhaps concealment, until the way should be prepared for his triumphant return. 3. That by his "*coming*," they meant his reappearing in his manifested character as the Son of David, to take possession of the now vacant throne, to which, as David's heir, he was legally entitled. They understood then, as Adventists understand now, that when Jesus should come again it would be to set up his kingdom, not to end it. And to correct this error, which has proved so fatal in its consequences, was a leading object throughout this portion of the discourse.

2. Having satisfied ourselves as to the meaning of the disciples, the second inquiry is, *What was the proper meaning of their question, as they stated it?*

As already seen, it evidently meant more than the disciples meant. And as we proceed, it will become apparent that the Master answered it, both according to their meaning, and according to its true import. This aspect of the case should not be lost sight of.

Matthew has probably given the question in the very words of the questioner: "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

This question, evidently shaped under the guidance of an overruling power, is exactly coextensive in its range with the wonderful discourse that follows by way of answer. It takes in its course the predicted events that were then imminent, and sweeps on through the coming ages down to the last grand scene in the world's history. And the question is clear, though nothing was clear in the minds of the questioners. "*When*" should the things just predicted come to pass? This is clear. "*What sign*" should indicate Christ's coming, and the end of the world? This also is clear. Αἰὼν is no doubt a correct translation of the Aramaic word used by the disciples, and very naturally applies to that chapter in the history of God's vast universe which describes man upon earth; or, as it may be known hereafter in the annals of eternity, *the Era of Redemption*. So the Master evidently construed it, and answered the question accordingly. He told the disciples

"*when* these things" should be. He also told them the *signs of his coming*, but not the time; which, he informed them, God had concealed from even his most trusted and trustworthy creatures.

But, as already stated, in the minds of the questioners nothing was clear. The disciples had some idea, vague and uncertain, that the power of Rome was to be broken; the authority of the priests and elders abolished; the temple and city destroyed; and that, when all things were in readiness, Jesus, the Son of David, who had been somewhere in concealment during these convulsions, was to reappear, take possession of his throne amid the welcoming hosannas of his people, and reign thenceforward in undisturbed peace over the obedient nations of the earth. They had also some idea of "the resurrection at the last day;" but, until life and immortality were brought to light through the Gospel, the future was seen only in dim and confused outline.

They knew not of the long and bloody conflicts, the fiery persecutions, the dangerous heresies, through which Messiah's kingdom was to pass before reaching its final triumph. They had no idea that Jesus was really to die and be buried; that he was to rise again the third day, ascend into heaven, sit down at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and from thence come again at the end of the world to judge the quick and the dead. Yet these things were to take place, and under Divine guidance the question was shaped, and the answer given accordingly.

While Jesus was with his disciples, always at hand to direct their movements, warn them of danger, and protect them from imposture, their ignorance and mistakes could do but little harm. But now he was about to leave them, and they must be prepared for the hitherto unsuspected dangers and trials that awaited them. They must be furnished with a chart of the future, by studying which they and their successors might secure their own personal safety, and guide the gospel-ship, of which they were to be pilots as well as passengers, safe into the desired haven. That chart is before us.

3. *The Answer of Jesus.*

This, for the sake of convenience, is divided into sections.

SECTION I.—Verses 4–14.

This section is a preliminary survey of the whole field. It is an epitome of human history, especially as it connects itself with the history of Christianity, from the time then present down through coming centuries; beyond the destruction of Jerusalem, beyond the generations then living, and unnumbered generations that should come after, on down to that time in the still unknown future when "this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." And it will be seen that throughout this survey, applicable to every moment of this vast period of time, there runs this one thought, this dominant idea, "Take heed that no man deceive you." We must never lose sight of this Βλέπετε, this initial "TAKE HEED."

"Take heed that no man deceive you," etc. The erroneous views of the disciples would render them exceedingly liable to be imposed upon. Supposing, as they did, that Christ's coming to reign in person was near, and not knowing the manner and circumstances of his coming, the information, artfully conveyed, "Lo, here is Christ, or there"—in the desert—or in the secret chamber, might mislead them fatally. And the danger was the greater, because of the signs and wonders with which the deceivers would authenticate their mission. And understanding, as they did, that his coming was to be preceded by violent commotions, they would very naturally suppose, when they should "hear of wars and rumors of wars," that *the end*, as they understood it, was near—that his triumph and their triumph with him was at hand. Supposing, also, that as the friends and favorites of this triumphant sovereign they would be advanced to positions of great honor and influence, it was but reasonable to expect that mankind would do them reverence—that the king's name and favor would be a ready passport to the respect and friendship of all his subjects.

But Jesus corrects their mistakes, and prepares them for the disappointment of their worldly hopes. He tells them "the end is not yet;" that nations and kingdoms in deadly conflict, famines, pestilences, and earthquakes, are but the beginning instead of the end of sorrows—of their sorrows. For he taught them, further, that these sorrows were not to be experienced

alone by his enemies, but by his followers also; and that, instead of finding honor and safety in his name, they should be despised and hated and persecuted on account of that name; that so bitter should be that hatred that the tenderest ties of kindred would afford no protection. He taught them also that this state of things was to continue for ages; and that through all this time there should be false prophets or teachers of religion, who would bring in divers and dangerous heresies, troubling the Church, and drawing away unstable souls after them. And still further, he taught them that the final triumph of his cause was not to be secured by the sword, nor, as some still hold and teach, by a sudden and terrible destruction of his enemies, but by the preaching of the Gospel. This certainly was a picture very different from that which their misguided imaginations had drawn, and was well calculated to prepare their minds for what was to come after.

Section II.—Verses 15–22.

This general survey having prepared the way for a more definite answer, Jesus now goes back to the starting point, to consider the question more in detail. But it will be observed that he considers it, not only according to their erroneous ideas of its meaning, but also according to its literal and true import.

"When ye therefore shall see the abomination," etc. This is a direct answer to the question as the disciples intended it, and, with the thirty-fourth verse, a complete answer. *Quest.* When shall these things be? *Ans.* This generation shall not pass, etc. *Quest.* What sign shall there be? etc. *Ans.* When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place—when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies—when ye shall see the Roman eagles gathering about the city, like vultures around a fallen carcass—then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then make all possible haste to escape; let not one moment be lost.

Section III.—Verses 23–27.

"Then if any man shall say unto you," etc. This section is a special application of the "*Take heed*" with which the Master sets out. Its primary reference is probably to the impostors

and fanatics who abounded about the time of the siege of Jerusalem, though this by no means exhausts its force. The disciples, as is well known, taking heed to these instructions of the Master, escaped both classes of danger. They fled just at the critical moment from the falling city, and thus escaped death or bondage in its overthrow, and they resisted successfully all the attempts of false Christs and false prophets to lead them astray, endured unto the end, and were saved.

In the closing verse of this section, the twenty-seventh, Jesus, for the first time, speaks directly of his own second coming. And he does it in such a manner as to guard his followers in all coming time against false Christs and their lying prophets. The *pretenders* would show themselves in the desert, or conceal themselves in the secret chambers; but *He*, when he came, would appear in the heavens. *They* would be announced by heralds, crying, Lo, here, or there; but *He*, in his appearing, would be self-manifest, and every eye should see him. The establishment and manifestation of *their* claims should be gradual, as adherents should be gained one by one, and as *they* should rise to power step by step; but *His* manifestation of himself in the heavens should be sudden as the lightning's flash, and universal as its light, all the world over. Keeping these things in mind, Christ's followers were in no danger of being misled by impostors.

Section IV.—Verse 28.

"For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together." This verse occupies a position so peculiar as to entitle it to special consideration. At first sight, it would seem as if this and the preceding verse must refer to the same event; either both to the destruction of Jerusalem, or both to Christ's second coming. Indeed, this is one of the principal stumbling blocks in the way of expositors of this discourse. Now the twenty-seventh verse refers to the second personal advent of Christ, as manifestly as any thing that follows; and yet, for reasons that will become more apparent as we proceed, the twenty-eighth verse cannot refer to that event, but to one much nearer at hand. The difficulty, however, is more apparent than real.

Ending with the twenty-seventh verse, our Lord had made

two important points. He had taught the disciples how to foreknow and escape the coming destruction of Jerusalem, and how to detect and avoid impostors. He was about to pass on to another branch of their inquiry, *the signs of his coming, and of the end of the world.* He was about to describe those signs, as contrasting strongly with those already spoken of as preceding the overthrow of Jerusalem; and before he did this, would place the two events themselves in the strongest contrast possible, and also supplement and enforce the warning already given. He would introduce an illustration that should at once reflect and complete what had gone before, and foreshadow what was to come after.

When, like vultures collecting around the fallen carcass of some beast perishing in the desert, the signs heretofore indicated were seen gathering about Jerusalem, they must know that its life was departing, its last hours had come. But they must not imagine this to be the end of the *world*, the *αἰὼν* of their question. On the other hand the fall of Jerusalem, with all its unprecedented woes and far-reaching consequences, was of comparatively little importance. It was but the fall of some lone beast perishing in the desert, disregarded and unnoticed but for the vultures gathering around it. What, then, must that event be, the omens of which he is about to describe?

Section V.—Verses 29–31.

"Immediately after the tribulation," etc. This section certainly relates to the coming of Christ, and the scenes accompanying and preceding it. At first, it would seem to place those events immediately after the fall of Jerusalem, to which verse twenty-eight evidently refers. And at this point Luke and Mark afford most important, if not indispensable, aid. In order to avail ourselves of it, however, we must go back a little.

In verses 19–22 we find Matthew's report of our Lord's sayings concerning the calamities that should come upon the Jews at and after the downfall of their city. But from this report we should form no adequate idea of the extent and duration of those calamities. Luke adds several important items in his report, (chap. xxi, verses 22–24,) among which are the following: "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden

down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." This gives a period of indefinite duration for the continuance of these woes. And it is clear, the second advent cannot take place until they cease—until, the times of the Gentiles being fulfilled, Jerusalem is no longer trodden down of the Gentiles. How long this may be no man knows or can know. But we do know the "end is not yet."

Mark helps us still further. As the case now stands, it would seem that the judgment scenes, or at least the omens preceding the judgment, must commence immediately after the restoration of the Jews—that when their woes cease, the purposes of God in regard to our race will be accomplished, and Christ will at once proceed to wind up the affairs of his kingdom. Is this so? Does this word, "*immediately*," compel us to this view of the case? What was the Hebrew word used by the Master, translated εὐθέως in the Greek, *immediately* in the English, we have no means of knowing. But, happily, we have the means of knowing how the *disciples* understood the Master. Mark (xiii, 24) gives our Lord's saying, thus: "*But in those days, after that tribulation*," etc. This rendering of his meaning would leave the time of his second coming, as he evidently intended to leave it, wholly indefinite. For, in view of his solemn declaration a little further on, (verse 36,) we cannot suppose that he intended to give the slightest intimation of the time of that coming. It could not take place until after the occurrence of certain predicted events, but how long after we have no information whatever.

Allowing Luke, then, to supplement Matthew, and Mark to explain him, all difficulty at this point disappears. And from this point to the end of the thirty-first verse the way is a plain one. This Gospel of the kingdom has been preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations; the days of Jerusalem's humiliation and of Jewish tribulation have passed; that long period of commotion, and strife, and persecution, and imposture have gone by; a season of calm, peaceful triumph has followed, and now the end approaches.

Section VI.—Verses 32–35.

The Great Teacher had now nearly completed the answer to the question proposed, and had answered it both as the

disciples meant it, and according to its true import. He had thus far answered both them and their question. He had indicated partially the time, and fully the signs of "*these things*" concerning which they meant to inquire; and had foretold *the signs of his coming* concerning which, though unwittingly, they really did inquire.

Thus far the two leading themes had been carried along together. Now, one of these themes was to be dropped entirely, in order that undivided attention might be fixed upon matters pertaining to the other. But before this was done he would complete the answer by fixing more definitely the time of "these things," and by admonishing the disciples to "take heed" to the signs of their coming. He would also place "these things" in still stronger contrast with his own "coming, and the end of the world."

"Now learn a parable of the fig-tree," etc. This section occupies a position very similar to the twenty-eighth verse. It reflects and completes what has gone before, and prepares the way for what is to follow. It gives the disciples information sufficiently definite as to the time of Jerusalem's fall, and urges attention to the instruction already given concerning it. And, taken in connection with the verse immediately following, it completes the contrast between the two events under consideration. It contrasts the *time*, as the twenty-eighth verse did the *magnitude*, of the two events. In magnitude, one is but a solitary beast perishing in the wilderness; the other is a world in ruins. In time, one is near, "at the doors;" the other is distant, and unknown to all but God.

This section represents the scenes to which it refers as then just at hand; the signs of their coming already begin to appear —the buds are bursting in promise of the summer—a summer of tempest, and earthquake, and death. "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all *these things* be fulfilled." What things? Those described in verses 29, 30, and 31? or those of verses 15, 16, and 17? Let us again read the former description, and as made up from the reports of Matthew and Luke united: "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things

which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken." Luke xxi, 25–26. "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Matt. xxiv, 30, 31. Now can it be that these predictions were fulfilled in the generation then on the earth? Can it be that this language is intended to describe any thing that has yet taken place in this world's history? If so, surely never did oriental imagination indulge in more extravagant hyperbole. No; Jesus never exaggerates. The events here predicted are yet in the future; but those foretold in the second verse of the chapter were witnessed by many then living. And "these things" referred to in verse 34, and "that day and hour" of verse 36, being brought into juxtaposition, appear in the strongest possible contrast: "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all THESE THINGS be fulfilled." "But of THAT DAY AND HOUR knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."

The answer is now complete—nothing is wanting. The boundary between the revealed and the hidden is sharply defined; and the way is clear for what follows, and which was so providentially called out by the form into which the question was providentially thrown. The disciples inquired, "When shall these things be?" and Jesus answered them. They inquired, What shall be the sign of the coming of these things? and he answered them. They inquired, What shall be the sign of *thy* coming, and of the end of the world? and he answered them. But, in their intention, the *when* was coextensive with the *what sign*, so that the question was implied, *When shall be thy coming?* And Jesus answered it in a manner that silenced the disciples, and ought to silence subsequent inquirers. That answer was substantially this: "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power."

Taking, now, the stand-point to which Jesus had conducted his disciples, and looking with them down through the coming ages, what a scene presents itself! In the dark foreground we see a people, once more highly favored than any other people under

heaven, now suffering such woes as no other people has ever suffered. And as we look farther on, there rise up before us scenes of tumult, and imposture, and blood, that seem to fill almost the entire field of vision. But as we look, away off in the distant but unknown future, there appears a tract of time during which the earth is at rest, the saints bear rule, and the knowledge of the Lord covers the earth as the waters cover the sea. But as it is so distant, and seen only in perspective, we can form no idea whatever of its extent. It may be a thousand years, or three hundred and sixty-five thousand, or only a few days. But it is seen to end—to end in the grand, final catastrophe. Jesus comes again, not now to suffer for the world, nor to reign over the world, but to judge the world; not to set up his kingdom, but to end it. Jesus comes again—when, God only knows.

Paraphrase of Matthew xxiv, 1–36.

In accordance with these views, drawing upon Mark and Luke when necessary, and supplying the connecting ideas in cases of abrupt transition, we might read somewhat as follows:

[Having silenced all his questioners and exposed the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees; having warned the people of impending judgments, and notified them that he was about to leave them, to return no more until they were prepared to welcome him as the Messiah, Matt. xxii, 46; xxiii, 1–39,] Jesus went out, and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to show him the buildings of the temple. Matt. xxiv, 1. And one of his disciples said to him, Master, see what manner of stones, and what buildings! Mark xiii, 1. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. Matt. xxiv, 2.

And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew came to him privately, saying, (Mark xiii, 3,) Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? Matt. xxiv, 3. [But by his coming and the end of the world, *they* meant the fulfillment of the predictions which he had just uttered; and not, as the *question itself* meant, his coming at the last day to judge the quick and the dead.] And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man

deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. Matt. xxiv, 4, 5.

[And if you suppose that my coming is near, or in any way connected with or comparable to these things which I have just predicted, you are in serious error. Or if you expect the world soon to cease its hostility and submit to my sway; or, if you suppose that your attachment to my person and cause will secure for you the respect and friendship of the world; you must dismiss all such ideas, and prepare your minds for a very different state of things. Long ages of sorrow and waiting are before my followers.]

And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, see that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. All these are [merely] the beginning of sorrows. Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. Matt. xxiv, 6–10. Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death. Mark xiii, 12. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. Matt. xxiv, 11, 12. But in your patience possess ye your souls, (Luke xxi, 19;) for he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. And, [notwithstanding all this hostility,] this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end [of these troubles] come.* Matt. xxiv, 13, 14.

[But this shall be many centuries hence. The overthrow of this city, however, is at hand; and by careful attention to the signs of its coming my followers may escape the general destruction.]

When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (Matt. xxiv, 15,) and when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Luke

* "Then the end *shall have come*," would be a better rendering.

xxi, 20. Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains: let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house: neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day: [lest being hindered in your flight, you should fail to escape, and suffer in the common calamity.] For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened. Matt. xxiv, 16–22. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! For there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Luke xxi, 22–24.

Then [during the continuance of these woes] if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. [For in no such manner or place will the Son of man make his appearance.] For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Matt. xxiv, 23–27. [And compared with this event, the destruction of Jerusalem will be an exceedingly trivial affair; not relatively more important than the fall of a beast in the desert, which would be wholly unnoticed but for the vultures gathering around the dead carcass, as the Roman eagles shall gather around this expiring city.] For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Matt. xxiv, 28.

But in those days, after that tribulation, (Mark xiii, 24,) [predicted, how long after it is not for you to know,] there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; (Luke

xxi, 25;) the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, (Matt. xxiv, 29;) and upon the earth [shall be] distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. (Luke xxi, 25, 26.) And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now, [before we entirely lose sight of the subject concerning which you intended to inquire, and to which the first part of your question actually refers; and that being properly forewarned you may escape the miseries impending over this people,] learn a parable of the fig tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things—[the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not; the Roman armies gathering about the city, like vultures around a dead carcass, and the like, then]—know that it [the destruction of this city and temple] is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things [of which I spake at the beginning] be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. Matt. xxiv, 30–35. [I shall now proceed to speak of my coming, and the end of the world; when, the entire plan of redemption being wrought out, I shall proceed to wind up the affairs of this world by a general judgment. But, concerning the time of that event, it is useless for you to inquire. I have already given you the signs that indicate its coming.] But of THAT DAY AND HOUR knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. Matt. xxiv, 36.

Art. III.—THE TWENTY-SECOND PSALM,

AS ILLUSTRATING THE SUBJECTIVE METHOD OF PROPHETIC CHRISTOLOGICAL REVELATION.

[Second Paper.]

In our former article (Quarterly Review, January, 1870) we brought to view the agonistic portion of the Twenty-second Psalm, not for the purpose of exhaustive commentary, but so far only as might serve as a preparation for our argument. We now proceed to consider this Psalm as illustrative of the higher method whereby divine wisdom communicates to man supernatural truths. In approaching the subject we must premise the distinction between revelation and inspiration, and between objective and subjective revelation, and the bodily and mental conditions of the recipient to whom the revelation is made. The difficulty we experience in grappling with the two great thoughts—inspiration and revelation—lies in the method of adjusting the combined agencies of the divine and human elements in each. A revelation must be something in itself absolutely above the natural reach of the human faculties—a direct emanation from God—otherwise it would be a deduction of reason, or a discovery. It must be *supernatural*, and yet in the mode of its communication not *unnatural;* above the plane and scope of human reason, and yet, as to the manner of its communication and reception strictly conformable to the laws by which the human mind acquires its ideas. Inspiration is that degree of divine agency exerted upon the human mind necessary to enable it to discern, understand, and record truth without mixture of error, and agreeably to the divine plan of revelation. As the revelation, on the one hand, communicates ideas conformably to the laws of the understanding, inspiration, on the other, operates in harmony with the freedom of the will. In neither case are the human faculties ever lifted out of themselves, or turned aside from the natural and orderly methods of their operation. It does not require supernatural faculties to perceive supernatural truths, but only supernatural aid afforded to human faculties. All miracles are supernatural, yet, phenomenally, they may be brought within the notice of the senses or the mental cognitions. Thus, as Bishop Sherlock

says, a stone falling to the earth and a stone rising into the atmosphere without physical cause are alike objects of sense, but the one is a miracle, the other not. A man dying and a man rising from the dead are objects equally cognizable by the senses; but the one is a miracle, the other a natural effect. All the miracles of Christ on the bodies of men were as perceptible by the senses as the previous diseases had been. But in spiritual truths the case is not quite parallel. The mind may need assistance to distinguish and comprehend, especially in a class of truths which have but imperfect parallels and resemblances in nature, such as all subjective revelations are. Hence the previous spiritual discipline and experience requisite; and hence, also, inspiration, which is at once an enlightenment and an invigoration of the mind.

In revealing divine truths to man two methods, and from the nature of the case only two, could be adopted. Either the human mind must be lifted out of its sphere and elevated to the plane of the divine mind, or the divine mind must condescend to human infirmity so far as to come within the human orbit, employ human language, and proceed in all respects conformably to human laws of acquiring and expressing impressions and ideas. The former mode is physically impossible; the latter, divine wisdom has adopted. In this method no violence is offered to the human recipient, no dishonor to the divine agent. The human element is purely and intensely human, while the divine is clearly and transcendently divine. Like the mystery of the incarnation, the two natures co-exist in harmonious union in one personality. The "letter" and the "spirit" constitute the revealed word: the divine idea is incarnated in the letter.

In assuming that the mind is always in a state of active self-consciousness while receiving a divine revelation, and that such ideas are received according to the laws by which all ideas are acquired, we do not detract from the supernaturalness of the revelation itself, but only assert the necessary conditions of the human agent in receiving it. And on no other ground could it be a revelation. A revelation is something made known to the human mind; and, as the word in its Greek and Latin derivation denotes, something *unveiled, uncovered;* and in the Hebrew, something *seen, perceived;* and is sometimes, also,

derived from the verb *to uncover*. To the mind of the holy man of old, who wrote as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, was the subject first *uncovered, made manifest*, that through the medium of his understanding others, also, might be instructed. There is nothing mysterious in this, any more than in the influence of one human mind upon another in communicating ideas; nor more than in what Dugald Stewart calls "the inexplicable phenomena of perception and of thought."

Different states, as to the outward senses, were required at different times, according to the nature of the subject to be revealed. In receiving some revelations the senses were closed to all outward objects, as in dreams during natural sleep. Thus, in Gen. xx, 3-6; Num. xii, 6; 1 Sam. xxviii, 6, 15; 1 Kings 3-5. The senses remained closed, also, during the *trance* or *preternatural sleep*, (תַּרְדֵּמָה, *tardemah*, "*deep sleep*,") though this "*deep sleep*" was not always for the purpose of divine revelation, as in Gen. ii, 21; 1 Sam. xxvi, 12; Isa. xxix, 10. This *trance* state, called in Ezekiel the *ecstacy*, (εκστασις, Acts x, 11; xi, 5; xxii, 17,) when made a condition of receiving divine revelations, seems to have been simply a closing of the senses to all outward objects, and the suspension of the action of the voluntary muscles, in order that the mind might act more freely and effectively in its undivided attention to supernatural things. Instances of this state in the New Testament, besides those above referred to, are found in 2 Cor. ii, 1-4; Rev. i, 10; iv, 2; xvii, 3; xxi, 10. In these and all other states of the body, while the mind became the subject of divine communications, the perceptive faculties, and often the sensibilities, were under an inspiration which enabled them to operate with accuracy and great intensity. It was hence the mental cognitions were denominated the most absolute of all human knowledge, as a *seeing, vision*, (חָזוֹן,) and the person who received them was in earlier times called *a seer*, (חוֶֹה and רֹאֶה.) A *trance, deep sleep*, might continue a longer or shorter time. There was no rule as to time but what resulted from the nature of the vision. Peter's continued an hour, perhaps, (Acts x, 10) Paul's, (Acts xxii, 17,) it would seem, a less time; while John the Revelator probably continued thus "in the Spirit" for days at a time. The mind must have time for the succession of events, and for distinct impressions and ideas. In all cases, however, the

prophet, or holy man, prostrated himself, as in Ezek. i, 28; Dan. viii, 17, 18; x, 8, 9; Rev. i, 17. The case of Balaam, as well as that of Daniel, affords some noticeable particulars. In allusion to the clear cognitions of the mind at these times, Balaam prefaced the announcement of his oracles with the stated formula, more or less full, "Balaam the son of Beor hath said, and the man *whose eyes are open* hath said; he hath said *which heard the words of God*, which *knew the knowledge* of the Most High; which *saw the vision* of the Almighty; falling into a trance, but *having his eyes open.*" Literally, *falling down*, or *prostrating himself*, *but being unvailed as to his eyes.* Num. xxiv, 3, 4–16. This unvailing of the eye, or having "the eyes opened," is to be understood figuratively of the mental perceptions, as the same figure applies to the eye and ear, Job xxxiii, 15, 16; xxx, 10–15; Psalm xl, 6; cxix, 18. We wholly discard the heathen theory adopted by the Jews, at least of the Alexandrian school, sanctioned by Josephus, and reproduced by the Montanists, that the prophets while receiving their messages or revelations were in a state of unconscious passiveness.

The methods adopted to communicate supernatural truths to men have been uniformly grounded upon two considerations, which have the force of laws: first, the nature of the truth to be revealed; secondly, the corresponding disposition of the mind to receive it. There can be no revelation without a favorable precondition of the mind to receive it. In regard to objective revelations, the mental preparation is not so difficult, but the law still obtains. Both the moral and intellectual states of the mind are accurately measured, so to speak, and the revelation adapted thereto. The process here must be gradational, from the lowest to the highest, from the germ to the full development; and the transition from the sensible to the spiritual, the objective to the subjective, must also be marked by the same gradational process. This is precisely the order of the historical development of the dispensations—the order from the Old Testament to the New—and in nothing is it more marked than in the special department of Christology. To Adam it was given in the general idea of a deliverer, and in language and metaphor most suited to impress his mind. To him the "Seed of the woman" and the "serpent"—their antagonism and

the triumph of the former—were easily understood. But the revelation was simply objective, with an admissible and implied spiritual application. In all the primeval period (anterior to Abraham) the Messianic doctrine existed only in "sporadic lights" of promise, couched in the higher allegory and type. In Abraham was superadded the more tangible and particular idea of genealogical descent. To Adam, and down to Abraham, the "Seed of the woman" assured the patriarchs of the *human* form of the Deliverer; but now it was revealed that this Deliverer was to be of "the seed of Abraham." The advance was great, but the revelation still retained its objective form. It came closer to the human sympathy and the realizing power of faith; but except in the "*Jehovah-jireh*," entered not the more subjective realm of Messianic revelation. The idea of substitution—life for life—as a ground of pardon and acceptance, was taught in animal sacrifice as an indispensable requisite of worship. The idea of a Saviour, under the title of "the Seed of the woman," and "the Seed of Abraham," was now also revealed. Later the idea of a ruler or king, was added. How could these meet in one and the same person? All advance in Messianic prophecy—we should say, Old Testament Christophany—was henceforward in the direction to shed light on this question. Into this, "the prophets inquired and searched diligently, searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, *when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ*, and the glory that should follow." 1 Pet. i, 11.

All revelations may be classed under the two heads *objective* and *subjective*. These are distinguished by the nature of the truths themselves, by the preparatory spiritual development required in the recipient, and by his historic conditions at the moment of receiving the communication. It is plain enough that if the plan of revelation proceeds upon the principle of bringing divine truth within the sphere of the human capacity, and imparting it conformably to the laws of the human understanding, the chief difficulty lies in bringing the mind, in its mental conceptions and moral sensibility, to a state correspondent to the nature of the truth to be revealed. Objective revelations—revelations of facts and dates, of historical developments and catastrophes in individuals or in empires,

or of doctrines as symbols of faith—could be more easily made known. Even Messiah could be preannounced in his human personality, his kingly dominion, his conquests, or in his prophetic office, without a high degree of spiritual intuition in the subject through whom the revelation is made. And for such oracles the "voice of God speaking," or an angelic ministration, or a dream, or a vision, might suffice. But there is a class of profounder truths—truths bedding in the human consciousness—for which these ordinary methods of revelation offer inadequate channels. The vision, or ecstacy, offers some aid; we may even say, with Lange, it is the prevailing subjective form of the Old Testament theophany; but it is not the only nor the highest form. There are ends which it cannot serve. It is inadequate to the highest reach of the ideal Christophany. This was the culminating point of the Old Testament revelation. To present Christ to the eye of faith in order that faith, by the Holy Spirit, might become a living channel of saving grace, and co-ordinately a preparative for the Gospel, was the end of all divine dispensation. The presentation is objective, the appropriations of faith subjective, Christophany. To lodge these sublime ideas in the mind, and to awaken the depths of its consciousness to a new life, required methods of revelation which should bring the intellectual powers, the sensibilities, the imagination, and the consciousness into intensest action. It must be considered that the true Christological idea must be *originated* and lodged in the mind. The idea was not in possession, and the mind was not prepared to receive it, and the knowledge of man supplied no adequate suggestive analogies. Something had been gained in the primeval period, something in the patriarchal, and an advance still further made in the dynamical Christophanies of the Mosaic system. Words had expended their power; types and symbols had unvailed a higher significance; sudden inspirations had afforded glimpses of precocious light; historic occasions, as in the case of Abraham in the "*Jehovah-jireh*," had added their tribute; but the question of a full ideal Christophany still remained unanswered. The Christological revelations of the Old Testament were incomplete without this. The ecstacy, or trance, could not serve this end, for that dealt only in scenical representations. Something was needed whereby the doctrine of Messiah should be brought

home more fully to the human sympathies. A scenical representation, like that of Acts x, 9–16, may present a grand apocalypse of the unfolding counsels of God; but an actual experience involving life, and interests dearer than life, would awaken clearer perceptions and profounder appreciations, and place the mind in a far more favorable attitude to receive truths congenial to its awakened sympathies. In the latter the senses are not closed, but intensely active, giving preternatural intensity to the mental operations. The highest form of Christological revelation in the Old Testament is not scenical representation, but historical enactment: not objective announcement, like the creation in the first verse of Genesis, or the Hebrew bondage in Egypt, (Gen. xv, 13–18,) but a subjective illustration, an illustration wrought out through the consciousness—the prophet, his condition, his mental states, his spiritual intuitions, his verbal utterances, all being invested with an ectypal significance. The historic present, replete with vast realities, becomes the penciling outline of the future, which the indwelling Spirit prophetically applies and explains.

And such must be the method, especially, in regard to that one profound mystery standing out upon the horizon of the dim future in distinct reality, and yet infolded in the "hidden wisdom of God" from the perfect search of even prophetic vision —the mystery of a suffering Messiah. How was this to be explained so that the idea of sufferings which stood alone, without example in the history of the universe, which "the angels" would "desire to look into," and at which heaven would stand awe-struck in reverent contemplation as all nature blushed and groaned and wrapped herself in sackcloth at the sight—how was the idea of such suffering to be lodged in the human mind a thousand years before its awful accomplishment? There were no historic analogues to serve as grounds of comparison, and yet the enveloped bud must be so far unfolded as to discover not only the flower and fruit, but its taste and life-giving properties. The bleeding victim upon the Jewish altar could not adequately foreshadow this truth. The foregleams of common prophecy could not clearly discover it. A Balaam might "take up his parable" and announce "there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel;" Jacob himself might foretell that "Shiloh should come;" and Moses

might declare to the people, "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me;" and far back into patriarchal times, upon "the mount of the Lord," Abraham might announce in mystic form, "Jehovah shall provide" a sacrifice; but still the question recurs, How shall some further, some more interior, subjective view of this vailed Calvalry-scene be obtained? In the nature of the case but one method remained. Feelings can never be described by words, especially where men have had no experience of such feelings, and hence no words or metaphors to describe them. This *experience*, then—or something so far resembling it as to become a fit emblem or suggestive occasion of the Messianic sufferings—must be enacted. The prophet himself must go down into Gethsemane; he must be persecuted, arrested, reviled, condemned by heartless enemies, and by them dragged through the *via dolorosa* to Calvary. The idea must be scenically produced from a real experience, as the suggestive, historic occasion and emblem, through which the mind of the prophet is lifted up by the Holy Spirit to trace and to distinguish the far distant yet now clearly traceable and adorable prototype, a bleeding, agonizing, and dying Messiah. A trance, we say, could not suffice for the attainment of such knowledge. A verbal message, divinely given and faithfully delivered, could not meet the case. The prophet might, indeed, have been employed automatically to enunciate words, of the import of which he had no conception, and to describe scenes of which the world's history could furnish no resemblance; but this would be no revelation, and could furnish no help to the faith of the expectant ages.

The sufferings of Messiah related to the soul as well as to the body; to the soul more than to the body. How could sufferings resulting from dishonor, indignity, blasphemy, treachery, fear, sorrow, and the withdrawal of the light of Jehovah's face, be represented, or the ideas of them conveyed by words or dumb signs? The ideas of substitution—death for death—of expiation, pardon, and life, might be given by the death of a bullock or a lamb, or by the *azazel* or "scape-goat," with confession over the victim and the figurative transfer of guilt; but the mind of the spiritual worshiper still needed helps by which to be drawn nearer the throbbing heart, closer in sympathy with the person and office work of the great prototype, the true

Azazel, who should "bear away the sins of the congregation;" the real "Lamb of God," which should expiate the guilt of the world. Signs, or picture scenes, are of higher significance than words, but experiences transcend all forms of language as the substance does the shadow. The nearer, therefore, the actual circumstances and feelings of the prophet could approach in resemblance the circumstances and sufferings of Jesus—above all, that most mysterious of all, his soul-sufferings—the more perfectly, vividly, and minutely would he be enabled, through the revealing and inspiring Spirit, to apprehend and portray them. Still the force of the representation would not lie chiefly in the word-picture of the sufferer, but in the scene itself. Here, then, is indicated the demand for that highest use of the human faculties and human conditions in order to the revelation or unvailing of the deepest of the hidden mysteries of God: a state in which the senses are not closed, as in the dream or trance, but open, observant, and wrought up to the highest intensity of action, as helps to the mental conceptions and feelings; a state in which the prophet is subjected to a process of treatment, with a view at once to the highest development of intellectual activity and of passive sufferings, wherein the *sensibilities*, and especially the *moral* sensibilities, are made the grand medium of suggestion of truths which the inspired reason is enabled to discover and record.

In the light of these principles let us now return to the Twenty-second Psalm. Two facts, as we have seen, are therein set forth—the *sufferings* and the *triumphs* of the Redeemer. In both these conditions of *victim* and *victor* the prophet is a typical person; his circumstances are typical, his sorrows and joys are typical; historically real, but prophetically typical. The outwardness of things is arranged and adapted by divine Providence to induce a subjective state, or series of states, typical of the mental agony and exultation of Messiah in his redemptive conflicts and triumphs. This outwardness, or condition of the prophet, is the historic ground-work of the psalm, to which the attention of the exegete is first called, and from which he ascends to the main and ultimate object—its prophetic shadowings of the deep and awful exercises of the Redeemer's soul. If the psalm fail to bring the interpreter and reader into the inner chamber of the Saviour's soul, and

discover to him the class and quality of those feelings which entered into the very essence of atonement—feelings which borrowed their hues from the eternal destiny of human spirits—it fails of the grand intention of its Author.

It may not to all minds have the force of a demonstration, or of an undoubted certainty, that David was at Maon when he wrote this psalm, and that the events of that occasion are the same as are briefly recorded in 1 Sam. xxiii, 24–28; but the historic circumstances in favor of this hypothesis are such as to entitle it to a preponderating probability. It is conceded on all hands that he was in the greatest distress, straitened on every hand, utterly shut up and surrounded by his eager enemies, and far—hopelessly far—from any human help, and hence commentators generally turn their eyes to the dreadful days and nights at Maon. None of his perils and escapes seem to have made such a deep impression on his mind, for though the titles of some of his psalms, and the unmistakable allusions, tone, and drift of others, clearly enough point to the sad or joyful occasions of them, yet to none other of the "rocks" or "strongholds" of the desert of Judah, or elsewhere, which gave him a temporary refuge, did he give a memorialistic name. But to this of Maon he gave the strong title of סֶלַע הַמַּחְלְקוֹת, *Sela-ham-mahlekoth*, which, in the margin of our English Bible, following the current of the Jewish interpreters, is rendered, "*The Rock of Divisions*," as if the allusion was to the *divided* mind of Saul, whether to pursue David, or turn back to protect his frontier against the invasion of the Philistines. But Gesenius, Davidson, and others more properly render it, "*The Rock of Escapes;*" and, indeed, here more narrowly than ever David escaped from his enemy. In either of the above renderings the perils of David, and the eagerness of Saul's excited hopes of arresting him, are fully brought out. Here Saul had completely surrounded him, and the rocky cave where David lay concealed had no labyrinths for retreat as at Adullam and afterward at Engedi, while hour after hour the circling lines of Saul's chosen thousands were cautiously advancing and closing in. Saul conducted the advance with more than customary military skill and caution, while David, like a hunted fawn, watched his movements and shifted his position from time to time, to elude discovery, and delay as

long as possible the fatal, dreaded, and impending crisis. The imagination must be left, with the few facts recorded in 1 Sam. xxiii, 24–28 and the Twenty-second Psalm, historically considered, to fill up the picture, if, indeed, any room be left for even the imagination to operate. The first twenty-one verses of that psalm, or, according to Dr. Horsley's division, (excepting a part of the second hemistich) of that verse must be supposed to have been written during the circumvallation by Saul's troops of the hill on which David was. These were hours of terror. The terrified muse of the prophet quivered like the timid kid before the lion's mouth. The perfidy, falsehood, baseness, and relentless cruelty of his arch enemy, surrounded as he was by equally cruel, reviling, and lying flatterers, all rose to view. Escape was humanly impossible. Saul would have given any thing less than his kingdom to satiate his spirit of bloody revenge. Like his great Prototype, David could almost say, "Father, the hour is come;" and to his enemies, "This is your hour and the power of darkness." True to his poetic and his prophetic destiny, he thought in measured verse and in prophetic significance. Himself the most illustrious progenitor of Christ, "a man after God's own heart," destined to represent the divine idea of a theocratic king, whose kingdom and dominion should become the truest type of Messiah's, his cause was the cause of God, his will the divine will. In his earlier writings is traceable a growing consciousness of an exalted destiny, the investiture of a divine vicegerency, and a corresponding oneness with God in heart and purpose. The developments of his history, and of the subjective realizations of his faith, were strikingly Messianic. This was his religious sphere. In him the Old Testament Christophany was to reach its zenith. He had early absorbed, in his inner life, the antecedent Christologies of his dispensation, and he was placed by Divine Providence, both in outward history and spiritual experiences, upon the line of genetic development of this great feature of prophetic revelation. At the moment of which we are now speaking he had reached that point in his religious development, and in his external condition and awakened sensibilities, to be fitly used by the Holy Spirit for the highest ends of prophecy. The images that filled his imagination, like the real causes of the sufferings of his soul, now became typi-

cal by a divine direction. The man, his sufferings, his enemies, the struggles and outgoings of his soul, his language, all became typical. Grounded in historic reality, his utterances, under the guiding suggestions of the inspiring Divinity, often so transcend that reality, though still retaining their naturalness, that the expositor is unable to account for them even by hyperbole or poetic license, but is forced to seek the true explanation where the New Testament has placed it, in the real history of another individual—the Lord's Anointed.

At the end of the twenty-first verse we may suppose the historic event recorded in 1 Sam. xxiii, 27, to have transpired. Saul was suddenly forced to relinquish his pursuit of David and return to protect his frontier. This event marks the transition in the psalm from the depths of distress, complaint, and peril, to the highest triumphs of joy and hope. The reader will better appreciate it by having the whole before his eyes. Adopting the suggestion of Bishop Horsley, then, as to the transposition of the second member of verse 21, the whole would stand thus:

20 Deliver my soul from the sword,
My darling from the power of the dog.
21 Save me from the lion's mouth,
And from the horns of the unicorns.

"And there came a messenger unto Saul, saying, Haste thee and come, for the Philistines have invaded the land." Saul hastily retires. David resumes:

22 Thou hast answered me!
I will declare thy name unto my brethren;
In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee, etc.

The "Haste thee" of the messenger to Saul was God's haste in delivering David. The divine object is secured, the instrumentality of persecuting malice had served its providential end. The wine-press of anguish had been trodden, and it had emitted, at the cost of every thing but the heart's blood of David, the purest droppings of the costliest truth of the Old Testament dispensation—a touching, graphic, and most impressive Calvary scene. The resurrection and Pentecost immediately follow the crucifixion. So with David. Instantly,

—"As the light of the morning, when the sun riseth,
Even a morning without clouds,"

the song of triumph and praise succeeds, and David's reversed history becomes the lively emblem of Messiah's victory and kingdom.

Was all this an accident, or was it in pursuance of a divine plan of revelation? The consistent believer in revelation cannot hesitate for an answer. But could not David as well have written this psalm in the quiet seclusion of meditative life, either as a shepherd of Bethlehem, or as a loved and honored member of the royal family? We answer, "With God all things are possible." We cannot deny that it is possible for God to produce upon the human mind, while in a state of actual ease, honor, and safety, such feelings as would give spontaneous utterance to the words of the psalm in question, and through them to have attained glimpses of a suffering Messiah. But this is not in accordance with his well-known plan, as all historic analogy testifies, nor possible without setting aside the ordinary laws of the human intellect and sensibility. From Abraham (in his "*Jehovah-jireh*") to Malachi, the prophets rose to supernatural visions through the medium of their historic surroundings. Real objects and events, producing in the mind real feelings and ideas, became the ladder of ascent; and through and above this outwardness the mind reached the sublimest heights of prophetic vision. The "word" or "voice" of God, the angelic ministration, the "dream," the "vision," each had its place and use; but in the dynamics of revelation nothing superseded the historic occasion and ectype, or fully subserved its ends. No method like this could bring home to the realizations of the soul the pathology (so to speak) of Messiah's mysterious work. For this latter and kindred purposes, but this above all, the prophets were put upon a previous course of training, and in preparatory conditions, so that, like all poets, (for poetry is the home of prophecy, and they uttered their oracles in poetic style and measure,) and in conformity with the eternal law of correlation of thought and language, they might

> —learn in suffering
> What they taught in song.

Art. IV. — SOUTHERN RECONSTRUCTION.

its obstacles, its progress.

At the close of our late civil war grave questions in statesmanship and in social science arose. Some of them were so new that the past furnished no precedents; so difficult, that all the accumulated wisdom of the age could not offer a ready solution. The perplexities were great, while the necessities were urgent. Something must be done, and done quickly. Under the circumstances, experimenting was the only way out of the difficulties, and this involved the possibility of running into still more serious embarrassments. From their limited knowledge and experience the purest and wisest of statesmen are liable to errors in theory and mistakes in practice; while modern politicians are quite as likely to blunder as the best of men. The questions for solution were not only delicate, involving the sensibilities, the prejudices, and the convictions of a great majority of the people, but they were also deep and far-reaching, touching upon every element of national prosperity. They took into their grasp more than the political and the economical; they included also the moral, the social, and the religious.

The sword, though it practically settles many great political questions, does not immediately change convictions. Overcome by a superior power, the conquered are not necessarily convinced that the cause for which they were contending is wrong. Their feelings may remain the same, though their condition and circumstances may have greatly changed. This was precisely the condition of the Southern people when the work of reconstruction began. They had been fairly beaten in the field. They had surrendered. Their army was disbanded, and they were at the mercy of their conquerors. Their love for the cause for which they had staked every thing was intense and absorbing when they entered into the struggle. It was the common inspiration which moved and sustained them in the conflict. At the close of the war that love had become more strong and intense by the sacrifices they had made and the privations they had cheerfully endured to secure their favorite object. Contending in this spirit, they

naturally came to hate the Government that was trying to subdue them as intensely and as passionately as they had loved their own political idol. That nature was not concealed, and it was shared by all classes, even by the women and children of the South, who did not hesitate to manifest it in all suitable, and in many unsuitable, ways. With this state of feeling at its height the war closed.

At this point their pride of character and of consistency came in. They not only loved the "lost cause," but they were determined to love it still, and to cling to it with their affections as long as life should last. They not only hated the Government, the power of their conquerors, and every manifestation and symbol of that power, but it was the settled purpose of their heart to continue to hate it in their inmost soul, even if they could successfully offer to it no active resistance. They had not sinned, they had not done wrong, they had simply been unsuccessful. They had no pardon to ask, no confession to make; they were not ashamed of either their cause or their course.* Why should their consciences condemn them when their spiritual guides, the leading ministers of all denominations, were with them, if not leading them, both in spirit and in opinion? In this the prestige of the Southern Churches was with them, so was the high-toned chivalry, as a unit; and last, but not least, the heart and sympathy and cordial support of their women.

These were the people, in 1865, to be reconstructed; to be returned to their allegiance to the Government which they did their best to overthrow; to be brought back into homogeneous relations with the general interests; and into sympathy with the national will as expressed through its constituted authorities.

The above, however, does not express the whole difficulty, nor indicate all the embarrassments of reconstruction. Many other complications entered into the question. Great changes had taken place in the four years of war. Four millions of

* Yet our contributor overlooks the fact that immediately after the surrender of General Lee the mind of the South was for a time humble and conciliatory. Bishop Andrews made deep and solemn confessions, and other Southern Bishops were for Church reunion. The tone of the Southern Methodist press was, for a brief period, right. But the politicians at length commenced their work, aiming at recovering political ascendency over the country, and the spirit of 1860 revived.—Ed.

slaves had been emancipated, and all the value at which their masters had rated them was forever lost. Along with these, hundreds of millions of other property had been destroyed. From so great a loss nothing, in their estimation, had been gained. Many of their illustrious men had fallen in the strife, the rich had been made poor, their country was full of widows and orphans, and all the substance of their land was devoured. All these things were mingled in their cup of grief. The newly-emancipated freedmen were to remain, for the most part, in the same section of country with their old masters. The slave had not been educated. It was not politic, it was against the law, to educate him. As a natural consequence the slaves, as a class, were greatly demoralized. The permitted customs of society tended still further to degrade them. They possessed a much larger development of the animal nature than of the moral and intellectual. They had been saved all the trouble and labor of thinking and providing for themselves and their families. Their masters had been more than willing to do this for them. As a general rule the native white population did not feel very kindly and sympathetically toward the freedmen as a class, especially at first. That was natural, almost inevitable. At least it should have been expected. It is a law of our nature that, under the most favorable circumstances, it takes time for excited feelings to subside, and for a great grief to pass away. It is not a wise policy, generally, to keep irritating the minds we wish to soothe, or to unnecessarily cross their feelings or to stir up their prejudices. The sensibilities of the Southern people at the close of the war were, and for a long time had been, unduly excited; they were in an abnormal condition, in a kind of diseased state. They needed wise counsel, considerate treatment, skillful practice. The political doctors who volunteered their services were not generally of this sort, nor at all in the confidence and sympathy of their patients. They often treated the case unskillfully, frequently prescribing irritants when sedatives would have been more appropriate. The result is, up to this time the disease is not cured; it has passed from the acute into the chronic state. The fever, though somewhat abated, more from the lapse of time than the effects of prescriptions, may still be detected by an unnatural pulse and a labored respiration.

They looked upon the freedmen as in some sense the cause of all their troubles. They wanted an independent confederacy, whose corner-stone should be slavery, that their "peculiar institution" might be no longer threatened or annoyed by Northern Abolitionists. Instead of protecting slavery and making it perpetual, as they fondly expected, every slave had been emancipated. The hated Abolitionists were triumphant, and a part of the spite which the South felt toward the emancipationists of the North they were at first disposed to vent upon the emancipated. They loved the freedmen less because the conquerors loved them more. Bleeding at every pore, and crushed by defeat, they saw their former slaves all jubilant with the excitements of a new-born freedom. The contrast was great on either side, and it is not strange that unkind feelings were sometimes manifested in their paroxysms of grief and sorrow. It is not wonderful even that a feeling of revenge, when not restrained by religion, frequently manifested itself in overt acts of violence.

There was still another excitant. They feared "social equality." That was an awful word among them; a powerful word, not of magic, to calm and soothe over-excited nerves, but a demoniacal word, to arouse and excite to their highest pitch their strongest, their deepest-seated, prejudice. This was a "harp of a thousand strings" on which both parties played, not for the purpose of casting out the evil spirit, but to excite to rage and madness spirits already within. Inconsiderate editors at the North, unwise newspaper correspondents and "carpet bag" orators of the baser sort at the South, for a long time kept the nerves of the South quivering with excitement over that question, until the Southern people could throw themselves at will into paroxysms of bitterness from which they did not seem anxious to be free. This fear, combined with other causes, led many at first to say, "We will not employ the negroes—let them shirk for themselves: let the Abolitionists take care of their pets." They had predicted often that the negro would not work—that he could not take care of himself—that in a state of freedom he would become utterly demoralized—that he would resort to thieving and robbing for a living, and that thus left to itself the race would gradually diminish, and finally become extinct. They must uncon-

sciously have felt a strong desire to prove themselves true prophets by the literal fulfillment of their predictions. Possibly, in some instances, there might have been a willingness to aid in bringing about an accomplishment of their frequent vaticinations.

They had been educated to believe that the negro is by nature an inferior being—some of them, that he descended not from Adam, but from some federal head of the monkey tribe, and therefore was incapable of cultivation and refinement—that it was sacrilegious to attempt to educate him and elevate him to the rights and privileges of citizenship. Their very soul, all their natural instincts and acquired feelings, revolted at the idea of placing the white and colored races on the plane of either social or civil equality. While the North believed this to be right, and the solemn duty of the nation to make it an accomplished fact, to the South it really appeared all wrong, and that it was their religious duty and privilege to oppose it. The honesty and depth of their convictions gave additional strength and persistence to their opposition. An error often committed at the North in judging the people at the South is, in not giving them credit for sincerity in their beliefs. Northerners forget that the people of the South look at many moral questions from a different stand-point, under the influence of a different education, through a different atmosphere, created by their divines and sanctioned by their most familiar religious authorities. And some of their greatest errors in philosophy and doctrines have over them all the force and authority of truths. A great point is sometimes gained when one concedes the sincerity of his opponent. As a general rule, probably with some exceptions, this concession should be given to the South.

With all these facts, convictions, and influences acting upon them, it was natural—it was almost inevitable—that the Southern people at first would oppose with great earnestness the elevation of the freedmen among them, either by education, citizenship, or the elective franchise. Time would be necessary to allow the heat of unnatural excitement to cool off, the strength of their prejudices to abate, their calm judgment and reason to return, in order to a proper view of the great political question in all its relations and interests.

Whether the Reconstructionists have adopted extreme measures, or pushed things with unnecessary haste, is a question which the writer will not presume to decide. The South having delayed to act promptly in the right direction in reference to the freedmen and Unionists in their several States, and by various overt acts, which were generally approved, or at least not openly and publicly condemned, showing that there was not a fair prospect of their acting up to the opportunities and responsibilities of the hour, the Thirteenth Amendment was enacted as a natural consequence of their *unwisdom*. Being still slow to come to time, the Fourteenth Amendment was enacted by Congress, and sent out for its ratification by the States. Still refusing to learn wisdom from the logic of events, they forced upon the nation the necessity of adding to the Constitution of the United States the Fifteenth Amendment, which is now a law, and one of the national statutes.

The South has had great opportunities. No conquered people was ever treated with so much leniency and with so great magnanimity by the conquering power. With a full appreciation of their situation, they might have accepted it in a truly loyal and noble spirit. Seeing the inevitable, they might have freely offered to yield what they could not retain, and thereby have won admiration by a becoming humility and true greatness of spirit. When their slaves were set free, they might have stepped forward and become the foremost advocates for their general education and proper elevation. They might have welcomed the Northern immigrant, when they saw his coming inevitable, in the truly hospitable spirit of the older Southern chivalry. But to all these opportunities pride, passion, prejudice, or a too intensified self-interest, had blinded them. Failing to perceive their grand opportunities, they failed to improve them. Thus their failures in peace were greater than their failures in war, and in the hands of the impartial historian will be more damaging to their reputation. They saw not the face of the angel approaching them, but only the back as he was leaving them for ever.

The work of reconstruction was still further embarrassed by their disposition to retaliate on those among them who had remained loyal to the Federal Government during the war. In many places there were such, and consequently hostilities were

carried into social life. Peace had come, but there was no harmony. Thenceforward was to be a broad line of distinction drawn between the former loyal and disloyal. The Jews were to have no intercourse, no dealings, with the Samaritans. There were to be no friendly greetings, no interchanges of social visiting, no reciprocity of refined courtesies. Southern ladies refused to take boarders into their houses from the North, no matter how worthy, intelligent, or refined they might be. It seemed to be a purpose universally understood and agreed upon by the friends of the "lost cause," to deny henceforth all social privileges to persons of the opposite party. They not only shut the door against Unionists coming into their fellowship, but they carefully guarded every avenue leading out, allowing no one to desert their ranks. It would require a person of uncommon nerve and courage, even if his convictions were in that direction, to pass from them over to the support of the Union cause. The severest anathemas would be thundered against his name; he would be expelled from their social circles and sympathies, and be despised and hated ever after far beyond the Northern loyal immigrant. That spirit continues to this day—a social despotism in the South as intolerable as it is unreasonable. That constitutes one of the greatest obstacles to the social and religious reconstruction of the South.

There is a rebellious idea called the "South," a purely imaginary fiction, which possesses over the Southern mind an extraordinary enchantment. It is made a high point of honor to be true and loyal to "the South." It is a social and moral treason to break from it; an offense for which their approved vocabulary contains no word of pardon. They judge of people and estimate their value by their devotion to "the South." This "South" is the Southern Confederacy sublimated and etherealized into an *idea* without a body, a form, or a fixed habitation, yet dwelling in the brain and cherished in the heart of millions as strongly as when its seat of government was supposed to be impregnable at Richmond.

There are now, however, thousands of people of the South, many of them intelligent and excellent, who would like to break away from their allegiance to this social despotism, but they lack the moral stamina to do so. They dread, either for themselves, their families, or their business, the persecution that

is as sure to follow them as the night is to follow the day. It is hard to begin. Of this, General Longstreet and ex-Governor Browne, of Georgia, have had ample experience. These cords, however, will give way by and by, and then there will be a rush from that fold. In the few years to come, death, with its busy fingers, will be thinning out the ranks of the stronger devotees, and after a few passing decades this unprofitable and imaginary "South" may become so powerless and poor that it will require the highest style of courage to dare to do it reverence. It cannot project itself forward more than a generation into the future.

The same spirit has invaded the sanctuary. Many have said they would not hear a Northern man preach, meaning, of course, one who sympathized with the Government. No matter how pious, how learned, how wise he might be; if his sympathies were with the North he would be disqualified for breaking to their pure and unpolitical souls the bread of eternal life. Their political animosities were stronger than their ecclesiastical affinities—the repulsions of prejudice triumphed over the attractions of Christian love. Precisely alike in doctrinal belief, they were perfect antipodes in spirit and feeling. Practically they changed the exhortation of the beloved John, "Let us love one another," into its opposite, "Let us hate one another." They gave occasion to the ungodly world to say, "See how these professing Christians hate one another." The plowshare of disruption has been ruthlessly driven through the most sacred, domestic, social, and religious ties, and broken up the good order and pleasant feelings of families, neighborhoods, and Churches. The strength of these animosities, and the extent of this social disorder in the South, as they have been manifested, cannot be properly understood by any description which may be given of them; they require contact, observation, experience.

The great question of reconstruction is not simply how to bring these revolted States back into a formal recognition of allegiance to the Federal Government, so as to have a due representation in both houses of Congress, but how shall be secured internal peace, mutual good feeling and sympathy, social harmony, religious unity, and spiritual prosperity? How shall the wounds of the war be healed; the animosities which

the rebellion engendered rooted up and removed; and how shall the streams of brotherly love and Christian fellowship be made again to flow into and fill their wonted channels? Such was the condition of the South, and such the important work to be done.

We come now to consider the progress of reconstruction. What has been accomplished in the intervening period of five years? Something has been done. It took a long time to begin, to get fairly under way, and even then progress was very slow. The lapse of five years has made its impression. Though there is still much bitterness of feeling, yet that bitterness has lost much of its intensity. It is impossible to retain hostility at fever heat by a simple act of the will. There must be some other fuel to keep up the fire. It is easy to see everywhere a general toning down, a gradual softening. Every disease has its natural history—a definite period in which to run its course—when, if the patient survives the treatment, it expires by limitation. Having spent its force and worn itself out, it finally disappears, leaving its victim in a convalescing state, unless poisoned by unsuitable medicine. So it has been, so it will be, in the South. This bitterness is passing away. It evaporated very slowly at first, but it is going more rapidly now, and its rapidity will increase with the lapse of time. Its bounds are fixed that it cannot pass. It will be impossible for the present generation to hand much of it down to the next. All the progress that has been made in the favorable change of feeling does not lie upon the surface, has not yet been fully brought to the light. This improvement must for the most part be set to the credit of time. Other agencies are at work, and are producing their legitimate effects.

It is a great pity that the religious convictions of the people, under direction of their spiritual guides, the clergy, do not take the lead of all other agencies in the proper reconstruction of the South. But as these guides sanctioned the rebellion, exhorted the people to enlist, and not unfrequently led them to battle, always praying for their protection and for the ultimate success of the Confederacy, it was hardly to be expected that they would suddenly change front, and be among the foremost in going back to their former allegiance. As a general rule the clergy are a very conservative body. They change

slowly, and when they have fairly taken a position supported by their convictions, they do not readily desert or surrender it. A natural politician will turn a dozen somersaults while a substantial clergyman is getting ready to adjust himself to new circumstances. The truthful historian will have to say that all those clergymen who plunged into the war, and went heart and hand with the rebellion, formed the extreme rear guard when it became necessary to bring the hearts of the people back to the Federal Government. General Pope said, in the autumn of 1867, while in command of his department of the South, with head-quarters in Atlanta, Ga., "that the greatest obstacles to reconstruction were the leading ministers and the women." It is a fact well known throughout the South that when the clergy ceased to pray for the success of the Confederate States they did not immediately begin to pray for the Federal Government. It is also a fact that but very few of them now pray in public with any degree of earnestness for God's blessing on "the powers that be." If they touch the subject at all it is with extreme brevity, and they seem to hurry on to something more congenial to their souls. They probably know, and that may be their reason for it, that as a general thing the people do not yet like to hear much prayer on that subject, much less to join in sympathy with it. The religious teachers of the South, in the true spirit of Christ, should have taken the lead in this great work, and Christianity should have become the most active and influential of all agencies in bringing about the needed reconstruction of society. But unfortunately it was not so, and that fact must go into history. It will prove an ugly fact to stare those ministers in the face hereafter, and a standing reproach to the Christianity which they professed to hold and represent. The skepties and infidels of the next generation will not be slow to use this fact as against the divinity of our holy religion. How true it is that Christ is often wounded in the house of his friends. We do not imply here that the ministers of the South are not Christian men, nor that they have not in other ways been useful to the cause of religion, but simply that they missed their opportunity, and did not do as they ought to have done, in leading back a straying and estranged people to the harmonies, the fraternities, and the Christian fellowship of peace. Their

proper place was at the head of the returning columns; but they lingered in the rear.

At the close of the war, as has already been stated, the whites were not kindly in their feelings toward the colored race. Their first impulses were not to employ them. Their necessities, however, soon corrected this error. Many who needed the services of the freedmen on their farms and plantations, or as domestic servants, committed two great mistakes, which their experience afterward corrected. One was to exercise the old rigors of the days of slavery—to whip and abuse them generally. This was partly from the force of habit, and partly from the spite which they felt toward the race, in consequence of the success of the war in their general emancipation. The other was a refusal to pay them properly for their labor. There were many worthy exceptions to this rule, for there are truly noble and worthy people in the South, who dealt honorably and justly with their colored *employes*. Yet there were too many instances of the former kind. Such got along tolerably well for the first year, but when they wanted to hire laborers for their cotton plantations the next spring, there were none to be found willing to work for them. Their conduct the year before was remembered against them. There was logic enough in the negro to draw a very correct conclusion, and force of purpose enough to abide by it. The consequence was, that many old plantations were not worked that year, and the profits on the cotton that might have been raised, but was not, did not find its way in the shape of money into the planters' pockets. Here was a new idea to them, an important one, and very practical. Those who treated their laborers well the year before, and paid them according to agreement, had no difficulty in procuring all the hands they wanted. These things were to be seen in every neighborhood—each class of employers taught the other a lesson. Each could see the practical effect of the other's policy as well as his own, and learn wisdom for the future. It is now perfectly understood throughout the South, that if a man wants to carry on business next year, and needs suitable laborers, he must treat them kindly, and deal with them honestly this year. It is wonderful what an effect this simple truth has had on the planters, if we take their own confessions and declarations in evidence. It was not so much

the moral force of high principle that brought them into normal relations with the laboring class, as it was a keen perception of their material self-interests. It was mammon rather than the spirit of Christ which led off here in the right direction.

The freedmen also had a practical lesson to learn. They were not, in the outset, all paragons of virtue and honesty. It would be a rash statement to affirm it of them now. They did not at first feel the binding force of a contract, and not unfrequently, after binding themselves to work the season for a stipulated price, they would leave and engage for some unscrupulous fellow for the merest trifle more than their first contract called for. When, misused afterward by the one that had decoyed them away, they went back to the party of the first part to be taken again into his employ, they found that they would not be received. Hence they would suffer for the want of one to employ them. There were many cases of this kind, but they are growing less and less every year. The freedman is learning morality and honesty by experience. Practical business, the mutual wants and necessities of capital and labor, are to-day doing more to reconstruct society in the South than all other agencies combined. These things have already done wonders, and are still exerting a powerful influence. They will work on, under favorable circumstances, until material interests are properly adjusted.

For a time many were indulging the hope that by some favorable turn in the political balances slavery in some form would be re-established. Hence they violently opposed the education of the freedmen, for that, carried far enough, would unfit them for any kind of servitude akin to slavery. They opposed citizenship and the elective franchise for the emancipated race. But since the final adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment became a moral certainty, more rapid progress has been making in reference to these things. "If the negro is to be a citizen and dwell among us, it is better," they say, "that he should be educated, especially if he is allowed to vote." As his citizenship and the privileges of voting and holding office, if he can get himself elected, are made sure by amendments to the Constitution, their opposition to his education is gradually giving way. Great progress has been made

in this direction, not only in the education of the colored people, through the agency of the Freedmen's Bureau, but especially in the favorable change of feeling in the white race on this subject. The feeling and purpose of that class, however, is still very strong, that the two races must be educated separately. This idea is quite acceptable to the colored people. They generally, almost universally, in the South, prefer to be by themselves. They especially prefer to have preachers of their own color, who know how to sympathize with them in all their peculiarities. This statement is made on the almost universal testimony of the colored people.

It may be well to state here that the whites much prefer to have the freedmen for labor, either for the house or in the field, to the foreigner, come he from whatever part of the world he may. That is the general sentiment. The talk of introducing the Chinese or Japanese into the South, or the emigrants from the north of Europe, will end where it began, in talk, so far as superseding the negro is concerned. They may come in large numbers; but the negro, after all—so kind, so polite, so obliging, so easily and so strongly attached to those who treat him kindly—will hold his place, and be the general favorite.

We have spoken of the progress of reconstruction only so far as bringing the white and colored races into practical, honorable, and friendly relations to each other, so that they begin to see clearly, and understand their mutual dependence and their mutual interests. Brought thus far by the principles of mutual self-interest, religion, education, philanthropy, and benevolence will come on after awhile, overtake the advancing columns under the lead of mammon's influence, and complete, in due time, the work so auspiciously begun. It is now time to speak of the feelings of the South toward immigrants from the north.

The feeling at first was very bitter. All sorts of threats were made against them. Bands of masked Ku Klux prowled over some portions of the country, whose purpose was in part to drive out those already here if their politics were not right—for that was their only cause of offense—and prevent others like them from coming. These fellows' hands are not innocent of blood. Many victims have fallen before their murderous

rage. A sad chapter the doings of those desperadoes will make in history. The retributive justice of God will doubtless overtake, in due time, all those who have thus imbrued their hands in innocent blood, and also all those who have directly or indirectly encouraged them, or secretly sympathized with their nefarious designs and deeds. Neither the garb of professional saints nor the clerical robes of the priesthood will shield the guilty in the day when God shall mete out to them their just deserts. Jehovah only knows how extensive and terrible has been the guilt of the aiders and abettors of this heinous crime, either before or after the fact. It will be hard for the historian to do justice to this subject, because so much of it is the work of darkness and of secresy. Thousands upon thousands would not dare to confess before God or man the extent of their guilt from a secret sympathy with this infernal diabolism. But a better state of things has already dawned. The mists of the morning that is succeeding so dark and terrible a night are melting away before the rising sun. Mammon is lifting up the eyelids of the people, and they begin to see men as trees walking. They begin to discover their pecuniary interests. What a pity that religion, with its sweet voice and inspiration from heaven, should let this low principle of material self-interests lead the van in this part of the work of reconstruction!

After awhile the Southern people became aware of the fact that great stores of wealth lay concealed beneath their soil in rich beds of coal and iron, and various other kinds of ore; that their soil was fertile, and capable of a vast increase of production; that they had immense water-power on their great rivers and mountain streams, with unrivaled facilities for manufacturing purposes. But with all these unbounded resources and facilities, their lands were worth but a trifle compared with much poorer lands at the North. They saw, also, that they had neither the capital nor the skill to develop these resources and to establish large manufacturing interests. The North had the very things which they lacked and wanted. If the North would send down her capital and her skilled laborers, develop their mines, and improve the immense water-power in the South, every acre of land would soon more than treble and quadruple its value. This was a great idea, and a great temptation came with it. For the sake of increasing the facilities and wealth

of the country the proud Southron proposed to lay aside to some extent his prejudices, and invite immigration from the Northern States or from Europe. The right chord of sympathy was now touched, the key-note was sounded, and the grand chorus began. Conservative editors all over the South began to change gradually their tone from fierce opposition to silence or qualified approval, until to-day they are loudly clamoring throughout the length and breadth of the "Sunny South" for the immigrant to come and bring his skill and his money with him. This is great progress toward reconstruction. The middle wall of partition is tumbling down, and you might hear many a stroke from a Southern hammer more or less vigorously applied to hasten its entire removal. All this in spite of Congressional acts and interference; in spite of political specifics and panaceas; in spite of much of the lusty preaching from Northern pulpits. It comes mainly from the natural development of forces inherent in Southern society, which become more and more disengaged and free as passion, prejudice, and bitterness subside.

Some of the people are much more advanced in this improvement than others. The less excitable and the more intelligent take the lead. The more clearly they see things, and the farther they can look into the future, the more practical and reasonable they become. The impulsive and the ignorant lag behind. Some cities and communities are more forward than others, but the solid phalanx is broken—the line wavers and bends forward in places; there is motion and commotion preparatory to a grand forward march. The cords which bound them down and held them back are giving way, and the progressive movement will be constantly accelerated.

There is another hopeful indication. As the intensity of bitterness evaporates from the Churches—for much of this bitterness, to their shame be it said, was in the Churches, and a great deal still remains in them, but it is gradually softening down and disappearing—we repeat, as this intensity of bitterness evaporates from the Southern Churches, a consciousness of their spiritually demoralized condition, caused by the war, is leading them to desire and pray for revival. Many of them are entering into this work in downright earnestness. They are asking, and they will doubtless receive; they are seeking, and will probably

find. Now if, even at this late hour, the spirit of a general revival shall be poured out upon them from on high—if the true spirit of Christ, in its fullness, ever enters their hearts—the Christian people of the South, headed by their ministers, will spring to their place in the front, and taking the leadership out of the hands of Mammon, will speedily bring this work of religious and social reconstruction to a happy consummation. There is the sound of a going forth in the tops of the mulberry-trees. There are signs of abundance of rain. May the Lord speed and preside over its coming! This we desire, and this we hope; yet much of it is of the nature of prediction, and may not be fulfilled.

Thus far progress seems to be destitute of the higher virtues. It is not of pure choice, nor desired for its own sake. It is complied with as a disagreeable means for a more desirable end. Hence, as a general rule, they have taken no steps in advance thus far, except as they were driven by their necessities. They may not feel complimented by this remark, which is made not for the purpose of reflecting upon them, but purely for the sake of historic truth. While they have come into more friendly and practical business relations with the freedmen, because they need their services; and while they present a more tolerant side to people from the North, because they want the benefit of their capital and mechanical skill, they still keep up an almost unbroken Chinese wall around their "Southern Society." The following extracts, taken from the *Franklin Repository*, from an article recently contributed by Colonel A. K. M'Clure, and dated Columbia, S. C., though professedly descriptive of things only in that State, is nevertheless, with but very few and rare exceptions, true of the whole South so far as family intercourse is concerned:

> The people do not war upon Northern men with violence, but, as is most natural, they will war upon the Northern emigrant in a thousand ways. They will shun him socially; they will avoid his place of business; they will not employ him; in short, they will render him only civility and deal with him only from necessity. Between the Northern people and the natives there is an impassable social gulf. A few Southern men lament it, but not one, as far as I know, has been able to open his doors to the most reputable Northern visitors and welcome them to his fireside and family. The attrition of business interests and intercourse gradually makes Southern gentlemen sociable, but their families are beyond the reach of reconstruction. Congress may practically

reconstruct the men of the South, but what power exists sufficient to the task of reconstructing the Southern women? When this problem is solved, the work of reconstruction can be completed. The solution is a question of years. How long it may take depends upon the measure of Northern immigration. Northern capitalists are now gradually possessing the Southern railroads. Factories will follow, and employ the fine water-powers and cheap labor so abundant here. Farmers will sell their Northern farms at $50 to $150 per acre, and buy equally fertile lands, with the most inviting climate, for from $5 to $15 per acre, and Northern mechanics must come to keep pace with Northern progress. Northern merchants will settle in Northern communities, which will have Northern schools and teachers, and Northern Churches and Pastors, and necessity will make the Southerner advance. The present generation will move slowly, but the next will be glad to accept Northern ways and respect Northern energy. The hope of the South is in Northern immigration, and the sooner it comes the sooner will the blessings of peace and prosperity heal the wounds and restore the desolate places of the sunny South.

This exclusion of Northern families and individuals from their social circles was partly from prejudice and dislike, and partly as a stroke of policy. They seemed to think that Northern people could not be contented to remain among them if not admitted into their "society." And as at first they did not wish them to come, or, if they came, to stay long, hence their exclusion. They have learned, however, two things: first, that the South greatly needs, and will suffer financially for the want of, Northern immigration; secondly, that Northern people can get along in the South very comfortably even without the exalted privileges of their social reciprocity. They find other ways to occupy their minds and improve their time besides running from house to house, making and receiving calls. The South find by observation that the imported Northern society can get along and flourish quite as well without them as they can without it. So far as their motive for exclusion sought to discourage immigration, it will have to be given up as utterly futile and useless.

Their fancied dislike to Northern society is founded entirely on ignorance, and prejudices growing out of that ignorance. When that ignorance shall have been removed by opportunities of closer observation, as it soon must be, the prejudice which grew out of it will soon give way. There are not a few sensible women in the South who do not approve of this social

exclusiveness, and will in a little while begin to break away from it. In a few places this work has already begun to show itself. We may look in the next few years for a great improvement in this direction. The South will yet rise above the influence of necessity to the doing from pure choice of worthy and noble things.

Human nature at the South is quite as good as at the North. When you get down through public sentiment, through the biases of education, and the influences of prevailing fashions and customs, that nature is about the same every-where. The human natures that were raised at the North, even in the State of Massachusetts, when long transplanted to this Southern soil do not become any more beautiful in form, or more fruitful in good works and noble principles, than the natures that are native to the soil. There is often a marked difference between the two classes, not often much to the credit of the importation. To err is human, and any people yet discovered, though in error, do not like to be brought to the right path by denunciations, or by what they regard as abusive measures. Force applied in this way, however well intended, usually develops the unamiable qualities of our common humanity. We all prefer to be kindly dealt with, to be first convinced of our errors, and then affectionately won back to ways of peace and righteousness. There is a world of wisdom and philosophy in this declaration of the Saviour: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." If God cannot bring men to Christ by any other than a winning and a drawing force, ought we to expect that God will, or that we can, draw others into kindly and just relations with ourselves or with each other by harsher and less acceptable instrumentalities? The Southern people have done many things that are wrong, things which hereafter they will be sorry for and ashamed of, but they did them under an awful pressure of excitement. They were a long time in a state of training by their leaders for this. It was the result of an education and of a growth in which the people generally were the victims, rather than the responsible instigators. As that was slowly coming on, it must not be expected to pass quickly away. In this, human nature will obey its established laws. Yet it will pass away, and the people of the South will yet in due time come out of their ex-

citement and abnormal condition, and manifest as truly noble traits of character as Christianity has ever developed in any people. Then let us extend toward them not only forbearance and sympathy but also Christian courtesy and charity; and kindly use the more winning means and Christlike methods to bring them back into all the harmonies of peace and of social and Christian fellowship.

Art. V.—THE EARNEST *VERSUS* THE EASY MINISTER.

"The age demands an earnest ministry." This is the language often heard from the pulpit and the pew, from the religious and secular press of the Christian world. And it is true. But it may be said that what is true of this, has been true of every age. Man's moral or spiritual wants are substantially the same in every age and in every place. He exists in every age as a sinner. But he exists as a redeemed sinner, surrounded by the vast remedial agencies which the infinite love of the infinite God has provided, and with all the mighty possibilities of his being within his grasp.

But *we* have especially to do with this age. This, with all its surroundings, is emphatically our day. And in many respects, it differs from all the ages which have preceded it. The dawn of the nineteenth century witnessed the inauguration of a new era in the history of human progress and destiny. The application of steam to the propulsion of the vessel and train—and later, of electricity to the transmission of human thoughts—has changed the whole face of the civilized world, and well-nigh annihilated both time and space. But along with these discoveries other mighty agencies have been brought into existence, looking to the elevation and the evangelization of the world. Missionary, Bible, Tract, and other societies have been organized, which are dotting the world with mission stations, scattering the leaves of the Bible and religious truth almost as thick "as leaves in Vallambrosa," and causing the silver trumpet of the Gospel jubilee to sound among all the hills and valleys of the world. Responsive to this call, startled by

the clang of this trumpet, the nations have suddenly changed their slow-paced march into a quick step.

Old forms of thought and action are disappearing in the dim distance; the lingering mists and clouds of mediæval darkness are flying before the light; thrones of despotism and tyranny have crumbled into dust; millions of serfs and slaves have "leaped to lose their chains;" the crescent pales before the light of the cross; idol-gods are falling from their niches and pedestals; and the great currents of human affairs are rushing on with a rapidity and an impetuosity never before witnessed.

The whole world is seething. The activities of the human mind were never before so fully developed, and thought is striking out on every line and in every direction. Hydra-headed infidelity is hissing on every side, breathing out its poisonous breath, and endeavoring to twine and tighten its coil around the fair form of our holy Christianity. Romanism, dying at the heart, but vigorous in its extremities, is striving to grasp in its iron clutch both Protestant England and Protestant America. These, and a thousand other things, give emphasis to the cry with which this article begins.

What, then, are the grand characteristics of the earnest minister which the age demands? Before entering directly upon the attempt to answer this question—and we can do nothing more than attempt an answer—we would premise, that if there is any thing in the universe in which man should be in earnest, it is in "the ministry of reconciliation." The Son of God himself has condescended to set all his ministers "an example that they should follow his steps." His three years of ministries to the people whom he came to redeem have furnished the most amazing records of labor which this world has ever read. But what has been recorded were only specimens of those labors, and do not present us with more than a tithe of them. It was true of him, as the Prophet declared, that "the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up."

The Apostles endeavored to tread in the footsteps of their divine Lord, and the records of their toils, which we possess, have astonished the great heart of the world for eighteen centuries. And all along those centuries there have been those, too few, alas! who have attempted to imitate their example, and, like the stars which "shine for ever and ever," they shed

their lustrous light on our path. It is in the light of these examples that we may clearly see who is the earnest, and who only the easy, minister.

As earnestness is demanded in every department of the minister's work, there is required, as the basis of all this work, *earnestness in his personal piety.* He may have vast and varied learning, splendid accomplishments, a fine and finished address, but without this "the root of the matter is not in him." The great work of the minister is to save men; which includes not merely bringing them to Christ, but also building them up in Christ. Now he who has not been saved himself knows not how to save others. He who has never known and felt the deep depravity of his own heart, who has never trembled under the burden of his sins, who has never felt himself going down into the boiling abyss of destruction, who has never felt the mighty hand of Jesus lifting him up and placing his feet firmly upon the rock, and who has never felt the power of the sprinkled blood upon his soul, is in no way prepared to direct, and help, and instrumentally save, others who are perishing. There must then be *reality* in his piety if there is earnestness in it. If there is any one thing which the men of this generation hate more than another it is sham, or hypocrisy—the semblance without the substance of godliness; the outside show without the inward life; the skeleton form without the living spirit. Painted flames will never warm the cold heart of this world; painted bread will never satisfy its hunger; and painted streams will never slake its thirst. Men ask, aye, they demand that the minister's piety should be real. If they have any thoughts at all about their souls; if the shadows of coming death and eternity come occasionally flitting over their souls and awakening their fears; if they pause for awhile amid the bustle of this world's cares and pursuits, and listen to the roar of the billows of the eternal ocean as they break just at their feet; they want some one who is able to tell them how to be saved, and whose character and example, as well as his teaching, will lead them to Calvary's cross and to the gates of pearl. Fashion, pride, the prejudices of education, social position, or family influence, may lead men to attend upon a ministry of another class, or to stay away from the sanctuary of God altogether; but ask any honest and intelligent worldling as to the character of the min-

ister whom he loves to listen to, and he will answer unhesitatingly, the man of earnest, warm, living piety. Perhaps the greatest danger to such a piety is the temptation, so often presented to the minister, to settle down into mere routineity, or into a professional performance of his duties. This must be guarded against with the most constant watchfulness and care; for if this temptation is yielded to, then he will be shorn of his strength, and become weak as other men.

But not only must the piety of the minister be real; his consecration to his great work must be entire and life-long. We presume it may be truthfully said, that every minister is tempted more or less, at some period of his life, to turn aside from his work and engage in some other employment. His temptation, too, often derives great strength from the difficulties and embarrassments which he meets in the prosecution of his work. His support is often meager, and entirely inadequate; his successes are not commensurate with his expectations; his labors are often unappreciated and uncoöperated with by those whose help he needs; and no one but his own heart and his God knows the fearful struggles through which he often passes. When thus assailed, were not his convictions of his call from God to this work clear and undoubted—were he not anchored to it by his vows of entire consecration—he would abandon his post and engage in other pursuits.

We would not say here that there are *no* circumstances which would warrant a minister from engaging in secular employment for the maintenance of himself and his family. Such a statement, if made, would be in the face of Paul's tent-making in Corinth and other places, and of the course pursued by many of our early fathers in the ministry. But this we will say, that when a man has vowed before God's altar, in the presence of angels and men, that he will "devote all his time" to the work of the ministry, nothing but the sheerest necessity should induce him to leave it. That necessity may arise from the prostration of his health; from the utter inadequacy of his support, or other equally pressing causes, but not from motives of comfort, ease, convenience, or wealth. It is, indeed, a pitiful sight—one at which worldlings "laugh in their sleeve" and at which Christians are sorrowful and ashamed—to see a man once mighty in the ministry turning from it to engage

in some lucrative employment, whether it be commercial, agricultural, or insurancial. A half minister and a half farmer, or half business man, or half agent, will never accomplish much for God and for humanity, however much he may accomplish for himself. Such ministers, if they would listen, would hear the voice of God speaking to them as it did to the pusillanimous prophet in the desert, "What doest thou here, Elijah?"

It has sometimes happened in the past, that when a large landed property or money has been acquired in marriage by the once earnest minister, he has turned aside, like Demas, and degenerates into a mere land agent, or a dealer at the stock board. But in opposition to all this, the Church and the world demand entire devotion to this one great work, making every thing else subordinate and subsidiary thereto. Any divergence from this weakens the influence of the minister, cripples his energies, tones down his zeal, chills his ardor, and makes him proportionally inefficient.

Here, then, is the true basis as well as the real secret of the character of the earnest minister.

Now, then, if the one who engages in this work possesses this character for piety, this entire consecration to the work, in connection with the inward call of the Holy Ghost and the outward call of the Church, he is to be *earnest in his preparation for it.* This we regard as true in a twofold sense: first, if there is the opportunity before engaging directly in it, he is to make use of every means within his reach to qualify himself for it; and, secondly, after having entered upon it, he will find that it will require his utmost and constant endeavors to show himself "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." As to the amount of intellectual culture requisite for engaging in the work of the ministry, there can be no fixed standard which will apply to all candidates. One thing, however, is clear to all minds, that the minister of Christ cannot possess too much knowledge, cannot be too thoroughly trained.

A new era has dawned upon our Church in the establishment of theological schools for the training of young men, who are, acknowledgedly, called of God to the work of the ministry. What the results of these schools and the training in them will be, remains to be seen. So far as our own denomination in

this country is concerned, they are an experiment. They have for a long time been employed by our sister Churches, and the results have not been always satisfactory to many of their leading ministers. For our own part, we "rejoice" over their establishment among us "with trembling." We have all confidence in the men who are now in these institutions as instructors and guides of our young men. May such men always be in these positions! But if ever the time should come, which may God forbid! when mere intellectual training shall be regarded, in any sense or to any degree, as a *substitute* for the baptism of the Holy Ghost, then, so far as their influence would go, spiritual darkness and death would overspread our Churches. The Church, doubtless, needs educated men, men of large and varied knowledge. She has always had them, and she always will have them. But we must never lose sight of the fact that heart-culture, spiritual power, the all-might of the Holy Ghost, *must be had.* Let the man, then, called of God to this work, avail himself of all the helps within his reach, whether from books, academies, colleges, or theological seminaries; but, above all, let him come to this work with his lips and his heart touched with the "living flame."

And not only so; after he has engaged in it, he will need to prosecute his studies, to add continually to his stores of knowledge, that he may keep pace with the ever-advancing march of intelligence, and draw from his heart-treasure "things new and old." The preparation for the pulpit, the prayer-meeting, the class-room, and the Bible-class is an ever on-going work. It admits of no suspension, no carelessness or indifference. Week by week and day by day it comes pressing home upon the heart of him who stands in Christ's stead to do Christ's work. The oil which he prepares for the sanctuary should be "beaten." The aliment which he provides for immortal beings perishing with hunger should be such as will satisfy their cravings. It may be easier, from very scanty materials, to produce, by much physical exertion, a sort of whip-syllabub; but this will not meet the felt wants of dying men. Hence the earnest minister not only reads, but "searches the Scriptures." And as a consequence his sermons, his addresses, his prayers are full of the words of God. Indeed, what else has he got to speak but this?

He is a "watchman," whom God has placed upon the walls; and what is he to do? He is to "hear the word" from the mouth of God, and to warn the people from him. He is a "witness for Christ;" and what is he to say? He is to testify as to what he has learned, and felt, and known of him. He is a "teacher," sent forth by the great Head of the Church to "teach all nations;" and what is he to teach? That they should "observe all things whatsoever he has commanded." He is an "embassador," and what is he to say to those to whom he is sent? Only what he has been before instructed to say. He will not regard that any words of his own will have more interest, more weight, or more power than those which the Lord of heaven has given to him. How did the great Apostle regard this question? Writing to the Corinthians, he says, I "came to you, not with excellency of speech or of wisdom." But he could have come thus if he had so willed. Again: "My speech and my preaching were not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." Further on he says: "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Perhaps one of the most hopeful signs of the pulpit in the present day is the attempt being made by many of our earnest ministers to introduce expository preaching, in one service at least, upon the Sabbath. O how often, when the people have come to the house of God asking for bread, they have received nothing but a stone! It is utterly useless to say, that if we are "shut up" to the word of God, the people will become weary with hearing the same truths over and over again. This thought, which perhaps rarely finds utterance from the lips, is, we fear, often in the hearts of some ministers, and hence the resort to all manner of far-fetched themes to attract people to the house of God. But the earnest minister has faith in the adaptation, the fullness, and the power of the Gospel. He sees in the Gospel not only infinite depths, but also an infinite variety. Like the Bishop of Meaux, in the time of the Reformation, he can say of the Bible, "All the eyes in the world cannot take in the light of that sun." Hence, while the infidel of the rationalistic school is saying that "the Gospel is old and effete, that it has done its work, and must now pass away before the brighter light of progress and social science,"

he clings to it still as "the power of God and the wisdom of God." The infidel might as well say that the sun is an old sun, and the stars are old stars, and that the time has now come to blot them out of the heavens and light the world with rush-lights or with gas. No; the same God who made the sun and moon and stars to light our path by day and by night has given the Bible, the only sun which throws its light upon eternity, to be a "lamp to our feet and a light to our path." For six thousand years men have been engaged in studying the wonders of creation around them; and for thousands of years men have been studying God's word. And yet how little is known of either? So the earnest minister has no fears of exhausting the Bible. The study of such a minister is something more than a name. All the stores of knowledge within his reach will be diligently explored in the accumulation of material with which to enrich his sermons, and to feed the flock committed to his care. Each day, as it returns, will witness him poring over the sacred page, digging into the exhaustless mines of God's words. And then, after all studies, and mingling with all studies, prayer, mighty, prevailing prayer, will ascend from his heart to heaven for the outpouring of the Spirit upon himself and upon his people. Every minister's study should be a Bethel, whose walls, furniture, and books, could they speak, would tell of the struggles and the communings of his soul with God, and his earnest efforts to become a "vessel unto honor, sanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work." Rutherford could say to his people at Anworth: "There I wrestled with the angel and prevailed. Woods, trees, meadows, and hills are my witnesses that I drew on a fair match betwixt Christ and Anworth."

With such a preparation for his work, when the man of God appears in the sacred desk his profiting will appear unto all men. The whole energies of his soul will be concentrated in his sermon. Before him he sees hundreds of immortal beings; many of them are out of Christ, blinded by sin, hardened by unbelief, and wending their way down to the darkness of endless night. He has now the opportunity to speak to them from God. Before another Sabbath some of them may be in eternity, or he may be summoned to render up his account. Faithful to his promise, Christ is with him, with his "all

power in heaven and earth" to aid him in his work. Angels are thronging the assembly, glad to join in its ministries. Upon the lips of God's chosen embassador the live coal has been laid, and the Holy Ghost is girding him with his almighty energy. He is standing in Christ's stead, and a beseeching God is his example.

Given, then, all these conditions and surroundings, did ever man speak with such incentives to earnestness and zeal? Eloquent he may not be, in the general acceptation of that word; the graces of oratory may not be his; his lips may not have been wet with "Castalian dews;" but earnest he is, he must be, and every look of his eye, every gesture, every feature of his countenance, every word will show the mighty movements of his inspired soul. It is man that speaks, but God is speaking through him. It is man who preaches, but it is in the "demonstration of the Spirit"—it is "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." All this is very different from rant, or mere physical exertion. Nor can any one successfully imitate it. The fire must be in the heart, or it will not glint in the eye or glow on the features. The Holy Ghost must be in the soul, or the sermon will be only an empty sound.

Let us now follow the earnest minister into his pastoral work. No man is more than half a minister who does not attend to his pastoral work. To this he stands solemnly charged by the command of God, by the example of the great Apostle, and his solemn vows made at the altar of the Church when he was set apart for this great work. Writing to Timothy, the Apostle says: "I charge thee before God, preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." And not only so, he gives us his own illustrious example. This is nowhere presented more forcibly than in our Book of Discipline, page 80:

O let us herein follow the example of St. Paul! 1. For our general business, "Serving the Lord with all humility of mind." 2. Our special work, "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock." 3. Our doctrine, "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." 4. The place, "I have taught you publicly, and from house to house." 5. The object and manner of teaching, "I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears." 6. His innocence and self-denial herein, "I have coveted no man's silver or gold." 7. His patience, "Neither count I my life dear unto my-

self." And among all other motives, let these be ever before our eyes: 1. "The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." 2. "Grievous wolves shall enter in; yea, of yourselves shall men arise, speaking perverse things."

That whole section (the ixth) might be read by all our ministers every day with great profit.

The great design of God in the call of his ministers, we conceive, cannot be answered unless they attend to the pastoral work. No public address can be expected to reach every heart or be adapted to every case. And then, it is only by personal acquaintance, and by personal conversation, that we can learn what are the wants of the people, and know how to address them. Then, too, there is a bond of sympathy established between the pulpit and the pew which nothing else can form. It is easy to form and plead excuses for non-attendance to this work. There are, doubtless, difficulties and embarrassments in the way of its performance. But, if we are right in our judgment, the minister has no right to plead excuses for neglecting it. His *duty* is plain. The responsibility of this work is upon him, and he cannot shake it off. The only one who can excuse him is the great Head of the Church. Has he done so? Will he do so? The really earnest minister, we think, will neither seek nor desire excuses, nor to be excused from it. He will go about this work, and do it, in the spirit of his Master by the aid of the Holy Ghost. He has time for it, because he is in earnest in all his work. He has adaptation for it, because he has the spirit of Jesus; and difficulties, dreaded by others, evanish from his way. When Dr. Wayland had resigned the presidency of Brown University, which position he had so ably occupied for twenty-eight years, he was invited to take charge of the First Baptist Church in Providence. Having accepted the invitation, he entered upon his duties, resolved not only to carry out his ideas of Gospel preaching, but also his long-cherished and earnestly-expressed views of pastoral visitation. We select a few extracts from his very valuable memoirs. He writes: "By the visiting needed, I do not mean a mere call of civility to inquire into the health of parents and children, and to manifest a neighborly regard for their welfare. This is scarcely the business of men charged with matters of grave importance. The visiting to which I

refer, is that which has for its end exclusively the spiritual good of those to whom it is made. This I attempted to carry on. I resolved that I would visit no house without introducing the subject of religion as a personal matter, and that in every case, unless it was manifestly best to omit it, I would pray with the family." He entered upon the work at once, and completed the thorough visitation of that large Church within a year. When he entered a family, he says further: "After the first incidental conversation I addressed the persons directly, and inquired into the prospects which they had for eternity." He would ask the questions: "What does your hope rest upon?" "How are you living?" and "What are you *doing* for Jesus Christ?" All this he accomplished when he was advanced in life, at the age of sixty-two, and amid many infirmities. Such a record is enough to put many of us who are younger to the blush, and to send us to our knees in penitence and prayer.

The language of our "Book of Discipline" is emphatic upon this point. "We must, yea, every traveling preacher *must* instruct the people from house to house." No one, therefore, should enter the ministry with any mental reservations on this subject. If he is satisfied that he *cannot* attend to this work, or resolved that he will not, let him turn his attention to some other employment. For he will only be part of a minister, no matter how eloquently he may preach, or how popular he may be in the pulpit, unless he is a faithful pastor.

It is easy for us to understand that a man who is thus thoroughly in earnest in the several departments referred to will be alive to every interest affecting the prosperity of the cause of Christ and the well-being of humanity. In all the mighty moral movements of the age, in all the benevolent enterprises of the Church, his whole soul will be deeply interested. In all these things he will not be prompted by unholy ambition or by selfish motives, but simply by the desire to glorify God and bless and save men. And O how much a man may accomplish for God and humanity whose whole soul is thus bent upon his work! Look at the work which Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and our fathers in the ministry, have accomplished! By their sermons, their books, their labors in the various departments of Christian effort and philanthropy, they have left their impress upon the ages; they have filled the world with songs of jubi-

lee; and they have peopled heaven with millions of a blood-washed tenantry. True, all ministers may not be able, either intellectually or physically, to perform the same kind or the same amount of labor, or to secure the same wonderful results; but all may follow after the deep foot-prints which those have made in their triumphant career from earth to glory. Now we say that this age demands such a ministry. The Church needs it. The wants of a perishing world plead earnestly for it. And the voice of God from his throne, and the voice of the great Head of the Church, and the inward voice of the Holy Ghost, command every minister to this work.

And yet it is painfully apparent that many are heedless to these calls. We will grant, what we most heartily believe to be true, that, on the whole, no country on the globe has ever had, from its very infancy until now, such a ministry for earnestness, zeal, and efficiency as our own has possessed. The ministry of America have, under God, saved it from barbarism, and raised it up to the very first rank among the nations of the earth. And the ministry of no Church have done so much toward this result as our own. That ministry have followed up the ever-westward movement of our surging population; have swam rivers, forded streams, penetrated wildernesses, climbed mountains, waded through swamps, preached in log-cabins and barns, in the woods, on the mountains, in the valleys, undaunted by dangers and undeterred by difficulties.

Great and glorious have been their successes! And we would that the mantles of our heaven-ascended fathers might be caught up and wrapped around all their sons in the ministry. But after all this is granted, is it not true, that there are in our own, and in the ministry of other Churches, many who may well be called *easy ministers?* Great as the results referred to have been, might they not have been multiplied tenfold—aye, even a thousand fold—if all had possessed the earnestness and the energy of the few? And is there not some ground for the fear that now, as the wealth of our Church is increasing, and we are a "respectable" people, and salaries are annually growing larger, and the comforts of our ministers are multiplying, for all of which we are grateful—and which, instead of effeminating our ministry, should only stimulate us to new and more vigorous exertion—there will be a growing tendency to make

the office of the minister a mere sinecure? We trust that such a fear is groundless.

But let us now turn our attention more directly to the easy minister. If we mistake not, such a man has low views of personal piety, and of the character and design of his call to the ministry. It is to be supposed that at some period of his life he was converted and called of God. But the glowing ardor of his "first love" has been chilled, and the tremendous responsibilities of his calling are practically ignored. He may be a "good sort of a man," but he is certainly very easy about religion. He is an utter stranger to the higher walks of the Christian life, and is too indolent or too indifferent to reach them, or is unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to tread them. He is very fearful of being considered "righteous over much," and rather boasts that "he makes no pretensions to great piety." He would rather stand at the base of the mountain, the heights of which others are scaling, and question, and criticize, and dream, than climb its rugged sides and stand upon its sunny summits. He spends but little time in prayer, and that is unaccompanied by "strong cries and tears" for himself and his flock. He has no *longings* for the salvation of souls. If they are saved under his ministry, well; if not, why, it is their own fault, and they must bear the consequences. He is not going to spend sleepless nights over them and anxious days, not he. It is enough for him to go through the routine of duty without troubling himself about others. He will preach, but he does not *beseech*. As his own heart is cold, his efforts are cold, dull, freezing. They may, indeed, be beautiful, "faultily faultless, icily regular," but they are also "splendidly null." The people are neither roused, nor warned, nor fed by his soulless productions. If his congregations decline, as they probably will; if his prayer-meetings are slimly attended; if the class-meeting is well-nigh abandoned; every one else, he thinks, is to blame but himself. Surely he is doing every thing which the people can reasonably expect of him. But the people among whom he labors, or rather rests, think if he was only more in earnest, more godly, more filled with the Spirit, things would be very different. There are, we think, but few Churches so afflicted with such ministers as one we have heard of, which, when the time of their pastor had

expired, asked the appointing power, more in earnest than in jest, "to send them a *converted* man, or at least one who was religiously inclined."

The preparations of the easy minister for the pulpit are soon and hastily made. Perhaps during the first few years of his ministry he has made one or two hundred skeletons, and they remain, dry and musty, as his only stock in trade for a ministry of twenty or thirty years. These skeletons are like the bones which Ezekiel saw in vision in one respect, although unlike them in another. They are "very dry," but they are not "very many." But he has rattled those thinly-clad skeletons so frequently before the people, that they fail to be either interested or startled by their noise. In fact, at each succeeding effort the effect of this performance sensibly decreases, as the preacher has less taste and strength to rattle them, and the people have less patience to listen to the noise. Or he may have procured one or two volumes of "sketches," containing the dry bones of other men, and these furnish him with frames upon which he hangs his scanty and threadbare thoughts. Now there can be no doubt at all in the mind of the thoughtful man that these "volumes of sketches" are an unmitigated nuisance, which every minister ought to scorn or laugh at, as a healthy man, with vigorous limbs, would at a pair of crutches. But some men go on these crutches all their days, because they are too indolent to employ their powers in walking abroad with a firm and vigorous step. What a blessing it would be to them and to the Church if all these skeletons, sketches, or crutches were burned up, and they were thrown upon their own resources, in humble dependence upon God, and in diligent effort to give to the people something new and fresh! Before the late Doctor Chalmers had experienced the saving grace of the Gospel—and he was a minister for some twelve years before this auspicious event—his preparations for the pulpit were very slight; but after his conversion the study of God's Word for his own comfort, as well as for the instruction and edification of his people, was constant, earnest, and life-long. The contrast is clearly seen in the following fact, related by his biographer. Old John Bonthron frequently and familiarly called on Mr. Chalmers. One day he said to him, "I find you aye, sir, with one thing or another; but, come when I may, I never find you at your

studies for the Sabbath." "O, an hour or two on the Saturday evening is quite enough for that!" was the minister's reply. But now the wonderful change had come which transformed him from an easy to an earnest minister, and John often found Mr. C. poring eagerly over the pages of the Bible. One day he said to him, "I never come in now, sir, but I find you aye at your Bible." "All too little, John, all too little," was the significant reply. O for such a change in every easy minister! But we must follow the easy minister now into the pulpit. It is the Bible which he opens, the word of the ever-living God; but he reads it as a school-boy would read his lesson, or as one would read an idle tale, or in so hurried a manner, and with tones so low, that no one is impressed. The hymns, too, are read without any seeming appreciation of their deep, spiritual significance. The prayer is cold, formal, heartless: and the sermon is dry, stale, and uninteresting. Is it any wonder that the people turn from such a service with loathing and disgust? Can we marvel that the secular press sometimes holds up such men to the ridicule, the scorn, and the contempt of the world? If these men were really true representatives of the pulpit in this country—which, thank God! they are not—there would be room for the unfounded assertion too often made, "that the pulpit has lost its power." So far as these easy ministers are concerned it is a failure: it is more—it is a burlesque, a caricature. It is not claimed that all men should be as seraphic as Fletcher and Whitefield, as mighty as Chalmers and Olin, or as learned as Clarke and Dwight. But it is claimed that all ministers, in their various abilities, should be as *earnest* as they were. It does not require great learning to be in great earnest. It does not require great natural or acquired powers to be an effective minister. But earnestness is the very soul of all eloquence, and never fails to command attention. And what a sad spectacle it is to see a man professedly called of God to a work in which Jesus wept, and Paul besought, and Luther thundered, and the Wesleys and Whitefield performed with quenchless zeal and ardor, and our fathers wrought with a heroism and earnestness never surpassed—aye, never equaled since apostolic days—go through its duties with the dryness of a manakin and the powerlessness of a pantomimical show!

But the easy minister is greatly fearful lest he should injure

himself. He has heard of some ministers who have studied too hard; he would carefully avoid this by studying too little. He has read of others who have worn themselves out in the ministry. "Foolish men!" he says to himself. "I never intend to do this." Of others, he has heard that their voice has failed in the earnest proclamations of divine truth. But he has resolved that his precious voice shall not vary much from a dull monotone. There is a saying of the Master's which it would be well for them to consider. "He that saveth—that is, shall wish to save—his life, shall lose it."—*Clarke.* It would not be wonderful—indeed, we fully believe—that if the record could be made, it would be found that the men who have studied most to "take it easy"—who have refused their strength, their life, their all to the cause of Christ—had been the earliest to fill their graves; while the men who have toiled the hardest have, in the majority of instances, toiled the longest. We would not assert this positively, but we have strong convictions on this subject, based upon facts within the reach of all, and upon a somewhat careful and lengthened observation. Surely Paul lived to be "the aged," notwithstanding all his toils and trials; Peter was far advanced in years before his martyrdom; and John, the beloved disciple, was a nonagenarian. Very many of our fathers in the ministry, amid all their privations, exposures, and labors, lived on to fourscore years; and many of the hardest workers of the present generation bid fair for a good and a green old age. All honor to these from the Church on earth, while jeweled diadems are awaiting them in the skies! But these easy ministers will run no risks, and if they have inherited wealth or acquired it by marriage, a very slight indisposition will send them to Europe, or to a life of retiracy in inglorious ease.

It could hardly be expected that such a minister would do much in the pastoral work. He will plead that he is "constitutionally unfitted for it," or that he has no time to attend to it, or that it would be "too great a tax upon his physical energies." True, there are a few families where he spends, in the aggregate, days and weeks. There are stores, offices, and other public places where he delights to resort, either joining in political debates, or mingling in neighborhood gossip, or retailing stale anecdotes and jokes to the present merriment of

the by-standers, but to the sad misgivings of thoughtful men. If he undertakes any thing like pastoral visitation, it is rather a social call than a pastoral visit. There is no religious conversation, no reading of the Scriptures, no prayer. There are not a few of our people who have not had a minister to pray in their families for years, unless at a funeral or marriage. Is it any wonder that there is so little family religion among us? That there are so many families in which the family altar has not yet been erected; or, if once erected, has fallen down?

Our people, whether in professional, mercantile, agricultural, or mechanical business, spend from eight to ten hours each day in active employment. Should not the minister spend as much time, at least, in his Master's service? And, if his time were methodically employed, all his duties could be attended to, and all the interests of the Church would be promoted. The pastoral work is a necessity in the Church. It cannot be dispensed with.

It is very possible, we know, for any one in the ministry, as in any other calling, to neglect a large part of the duties pertaining to that calling. This may be done without incurring any ecclesiastical penalty, or becoming subject to any discipline. There are a thousand ways of shirking duty and throwing off responsibility. True, such easy ministers as do these things will render themselves undesired, and it will be difficult for the appointing power of our Church to find a place for them, and in other Churches it will be difficult to obtain a "call." But all these things are *risked* by them. In our own Church, he knows that unless located—a very difficult thing to be done, by the way—he will have *some* appointment. In other Churches the case is different, and ministers are standing by the hundreds in the "ecclesiastical market-places" idle, saying, "No man hath hired us." It is a melancholy fact that, in our sister denominations, there are hundreds of Churches without Pastors, and hundreds of ministers without a charge. Why is all this? There must be a sad defect somewhere. It is doubtless true, as a rule, that in all branches of the Church an earnest, faithful, devoted minister will be sought after; while, on the other hand, no Church wants an easy minister. The demand of the Church is for *live* men; and if any others are taken, it is with reluctance, and only for the want of a better supply. What

is wanted in the great world-field is *laborers;* not men called ministers merely—not mere "functionaries for hire"—but, we repeat it, laborers. And in God's great vineyard such men are always in demand. For such there is never any lack of employ. Other labors may be suspended or remitted; in this there can be neither remission nor suspension. It is a life-long work for the individual; it is a time-long work for the Church. And yet, notwithstanding all these facts, how many slide through from year to year, barely acceptable to the people, perfunctorily going through the dull round of their duties, grumbling because they are not more noticed and better provided for by the authorities of the Church, framing many excuses to themselves and to others why they are not more useful, and sinking down finally into an early superannuation, or into some humble secular employment.

We write not thus for the purpose of making invidious comparisons, but to call attention to facts which must press themselves upon the notice of every intelligent observer. The most earnest, faithful, and successful minister is conscious of many, many defects. And the more in earnest men are, the more deeply they feel their own weakness, and the more they tremble under the burden of their responsibility. We would that every minister in the land, amid the stirring, world-moving activities of this nineteenth century—in view of the pressing demands made upon us by a perishing world—in view of the imploring appeals of Zion as she is assailed by Rationalism, Pantheism, Romanism, and Infidelity—by wicked men, and all the swarming legions of hell, and by the inrushing tide of worldliness and corruption, while the clarion-blast of her great King calls every man to his post to dare, and do, and die in his service, would renew his vows of consecration, renounce all idea of secular employment, buckle on his heaven-furnished armor afresh, and then work and toil, and live and labor "unto death" for Jesus. The world-siren and Satan may whisper in our ears, "You had better take it easy;" "You will wear yourself out." Let our answer to all such whisperings be, "To wear out in the service of such a Master is our highest ambition, our most cherished desire." Secular employments may tempt us by the prospect of a large increase of worldly gain. But let us remember two things: first, those hopes which the

world holds out are not always realized, or the benefits which it promises are but uncertain and temporary; and, secondly, that Christ always takes care of his faithful laborers. Suppose that Jesus were to call all his faithful laborers before him now, as of old he called his few chosen and faithful Apostles, and were to ask these laborers, as he asked them, "When I sent you forth without purse or scrip lacked ye any thing?" would they not have to answer as the Apostles did, "Nothing, Lord?" And yet another thing ought to be observed here. By engaging in worldly pursuits we might obtain, as some others do, money for ourselves and our families. We might have fine farms, fine houses, fine equipages. But what are they all? Especially, what are they all when viewed in comparison with the starry diadem, the fadeless mansion, and the everlasting joys of the heavenly world! But some may be ready to ask, "Can we not have all the former things and the latter too?" This may be barely possible: although if a man voluntarily ignores the call of God, violates his vows made at God's altar, and abandons his work merely for temporal gain, we cannot see how he can expect at last the approval of his Judge or admission into his everlasting kingdom. And yet we would judge no man. But we would say, if we must have our choice of poverty, trial, sorrow, and suffering here, with Jesus's presence with us, and angel ministrants around us, and souls gathered from sin and Satan's power; and then, when the short period of labor is over, have the crown of life and the glories of heaven vastly augmented by our labors, and toils, and privations and sorrows; or, by retiring from this work, and holding only a nominal connection with it, may have health, ease, worldly position and honor, with qualms and stings of conscience, souls perishing through our neglect, the Church ashamed and mourning over our delinquency, and then die under a cloud; and if heaven is obtained at all, wearing a starless diadem, and "saved only as by fire," let us choose with deathless ardor the former, and live, live to Christ, and labor, labor for Christ. In a word, let us be earnest, and not easy, ministers.

Art. VI.—TRAINING OF DEAF MUTES.

American Annals of Deaf and Dumb. A monthly periodical published in Washington, D. C.

Reports of the New York Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb.

Reports of the Clarke Institution for Deaf Mutes. Northampton, Mass.

Two Reports on the Institutions for the Deaf and Dumb in Central and Western Europe, and in Holland and Paris, in 1844–1859. By George E. Day, D.D.

Report on the Methods of Instruction in the Deaf and Dumb Institutions of Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Ireland. By Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D.

Reports of Massachusetts Board of State Charities.

As the divine and unquestionable signs of his Messiahship, our Lord said to the inquiring disciples of John Baptist, "tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the Gospel is preached." The Christianity of the present age can point to most of these evidences of the purity and divine vigor of its faith in the same Master. The spirit of Christ within the Christian Church exhibits itself in bestowing eyes upon the blind, both by skillful surgery and by the successful training of the hand largely to replace the loss of vision; in supplying cunningly contrived limbs for the lame; in mitigating the horrors and removing the causes of the most malignant diseases; in enabling the deaf mute to communicate with his fellows as if the lost sense of hearing had been returned to him; the down-trodden and abandoned, dead in trespasses and sins to hope and usefulness, have been raised to life; and to the poorest and most neglected classes, with increasing earnestness, the Gospel is preached. None of these practical forms of charity antedated the Christian era; but, following the example of her Lord who went about doing good, just in proportion to her purity, the Church has bestowed her benedictions and benefactions upon the bodies as well as souls of men. With the revival of letters in the later centuries, and the general intellectual quickening throughout Christendom, there has been a significant advance all along the line of charity; and every practicable invention of the human mind has been devoted, by the prevailing influence of the Christian spirit, to the amelioration of human suffering or the elevation of the depressed classes of society.

There are two classes unfortunately found in considerable numbers in civilized lands—because they escape the death to which they would have been consigned in infancy in barbarous countries—occasioned, perhaps, by too close intermarriages of blood-kindred, by the diseased condition of parents, by hereditary tendencies, and by subtile and, as yet, undiscovered causes. These are the blind and the deaf. No afflicted persons appeal with more mute eloquence than these to Christian hearts for aid to bring them out of their painful isolation, if possible, into the enjoyment of human society and intellectual and moral cultivation. The loss of vision is the most terrible calamity that can befall a man, considered simply as a physical being, but the congenital loss of hearing is a more fearful impediment to the development of his intellectual and spiritual nature.

No human work, at first view, seems so hopeless as the attempt to awaken and develop a mind that cannot be reached through the sense of hearing. Dr. Johnson was so impressed with the amazing difficulties that must be overcome before any appreciable success could be attained in the release of these imprisoned minds, that he represents the education of the deaf and dumb as a great philosophical curiosity. The hearing infant has no teacher to instruct him in the language of his parentage. The mother and the nurse are constantly pouring grateful sounds into his ears; almost involuntarily he imitates them. He associates words with his wants, with the objects that meet his eyes, and their appropriate ideas are clearly defined in his mind. By incessant questions and unwearied answers his vocabulary and his sphere of knowledge are enlarged. If in the society of cultivated relatives, without being aware of the severe work that has been accomplished, before he steps his foot into a school, he has learned one of the most difficult languages that the tongue attempts to utter, and without the use of a dictionary or a grammar, has become able to speak correctly, to understand quite a broad section of his native idiom, and is in a condition, without hinderance, to enter upon the whole field of human knowledge.

But how is it with the child born deaf? Ordinarily the silence or inarticulateness of the child is attributed to some impediment in the speech, and the parent eagerly but vainly waits for the string of the tongue to be loosed. The lack of

response to maternal tenderness is often attributed to idiocy or stupidity. It is not the speaking, but the hearing organ that is at fault. The harmonious waves of that involuntary teaching—the human voice—have broken without significance upon the ear, and the moving lips have conveyed no idea to the mind.

The great problem is to establish some common medium of communication by which a teacher may approach such a mind. As the ear is closed, the eye becomes the most inviting avenue for this entrance, and natural signs, such as laughing, weeping, motions of the hands, suggest the possible way of reaching the sepulchred thoughts and calling them into active exercise. By a hand alphabet words may be easily learned; but then comes the more serious problem of connecting these words with their appropriate ideas. The deaf have two different languages to learn under the most unfavorable circumstances—the language of signs as expressing ideas, and then the language of words as expressing the same ideas. As they do not hear the latter spoken, as only the nouns, or names of natural objects, can be readily represented to the eye, it can be easily seen how wearisome and difficult the work must be to lead such a chained mind along so mysterious a path, and how slowly and carefully it must be pursued to keep the idea and the sign or word permanently associated together. We can also easily see how valueless the acquiring of a knowledge of words would be, when, having simply learned the alphabet of a foreign tongue, we take up a volume and read a page of it. We may have read the words correctly, but not an idea have we received from them.

When Abbé de l'Epée, of Paris, (to whom, perhaps, deaf mutes owe more than to any other person,) whose interest and untiring zeal had been awakened in behalf of these silent sufferers by a call upon two sisters, whose lack of response to his address he could not at first comprehend, and whose great misfortune, when he discovered it, made an ineffaceable impression upon his heart, after meditating long upon the subject, grasped by a sudden inspiration the thought that all language was simply signs of ideas, that gestures were also signs of ideas, and that there might be a language of gestures as well as of arbitrary words, he at once hastened, with devout enthusiasm, to execute his plan growing out of this conception. His suc-

cess in the years following 1755 became the marvel of Europe. With his first pupils he gathered others, all of them of the poorest class, even refusing the children of wealth though pressed upon him with large pecuniary offers, esteeming the former to be greater sufferers from their loss of this important sense than the children of the rich. He soon by signs made them familiar with their written native language, and enabled them to transcribe whole pages of the most abstract disquisitions by the intermedium of gestures; but these gestures, which they had mechanically associated with certain characters, conveyed to them no notion of the real signification of those characters; for, as in every language words are but conventional signs, it is clear that, before their meaning could have been agreed upon, there must have existed some prior language mutually understood by the parties making the agreement,* such language as hieroglyphics, for instance. The great and fatal deficiency in the system of De l'Epée was soon seen. A school had been established by Abbé Storck, according to this method, in Vienna, and, at a public exhibition, questions were asked by signs, and readily answered by the pupils in written words upon the blackboard. Mr. Nicolai, an academician of Berlin, who was present, proposed that the pupils should describe in writing the meaning of a significant act which he would perform. His request was granted. Mr. Nicolai then struck his breast with his hand, and the deaf and dumb boy simply wrote upon the board the words, *hand*, *breast*,† showing that neither the sign nor the words conveyed to him an idea, only as far as he had been taught that a certain gesture stood for a certain word, and both expressed a certain thing. Out of this very limited vocabulary he was utterly in the dark. Abbé de l'Epée's system provided a separate sign for every word used. He held that there was no more necessary or natural connection between an idea and an articulate sound striking the ear, than between the same idea, properly expressed by a natural sign, striking upon the eye; but while he found many signs almost instinctively embodying the wants and simple conceptions of deaf children, in his attempt to make a sign language entirely equivalent to ordinary speech, he overlooked, in too

* Encyclopædia Britannica.

† Encyclopædia Britannica, Art., Deaf and Dumb.

large a measure, the mental condition of his pupils in reference to the paucity of their ideas; and while he had no difficulty in showing them that a certain easily remembered sign stood for a word which they could read in a book or write upon the board, he was sometimes only developing their habits of attention and memory, not their thoughts. This often occurs with speaking pupils, when lessons are only verbally learned, without a clear conception of their meaning; his pupils had often no true mental picture of what is signified by both word and sign, but were mere parrots, rather than intelligent, educated scholars.

His eminent associate, successor, and intellectual superior, Abbé Sicard, saw this deficiency, and by simplifying and improving the sign language, and especially by rendering it the vernacular language of the mute, in which he should conduct his thinking, and afterward translate his sign speech into hand-*spelling* or written language, he secured a more positive and broader mental culture, and gradually led his pupils into the intellectual appreciation of the written literature of their native, and even foreign tongues, and to a rapid and satisfactory moral and religious development. Improvements have constantly been made upon this "natural method," as it is called, by the successors of these benevolent and devoted Catholic priests, down to the present Director of the great Paris Institution for Deaf Mutes, the distinguished Professor Leon Vaisse, who enjoys a high reputation as an original and successful teacher in Europe and America.

But particularly in our country has this system for the training of this unfortunate class been brought to a gratifying perfection. In 1815 several gentlemen of Hartford, influenced by their sympathy for a very interesting daughter of one of their number, an eminent physician, Miss Alice Cogswell, whose intellectual and moral development afterward, alone, was an ample compensation for their zeal and pecuniary sacrifices, sent to Europe a young clergyman whose name has since gained a world-wide reputation—Rev. T. H. Gallaudet—to qualify himself to become a teacher of deaf mutes. Meeting with an illiberal reception in England, he passed over to France, and found a warm welcome at the hand of Abbé Sicard. He enjoyed his instructions for three months, and then returned to this country, bringing with him M. Laurent Clerc, who still

survives, an educated deaf mute, and one of the favorite pupils of Sicard.

In 1817 the first Deaf and Dumb Asylum in this country, ultimately deservedly bearing (as for a long period it stood alone, and received a small national endowment) the title of the American Asylum, was opened at Hartford. A succession of very able principals and professors, many of the latter becoming the heads of institutions afterward established in different States, all of which, with two or three late exceptions, have accepted the same general system of instruction, has secured for it a careful and high elaboration, a very wide development, and made it to stand forth as a leading and representative school of training for the instruction of this large and interesting class of persons.

Particularly has this system of natural signs been brought to a remarkable degree of efficiency in the hands of the eminent and now truly venerable Dr. Peet, of the New York Institution, (for a half century an instructor of the deaf, an original investigator and writer upon the theme, to whom our country owes a large debt of respect for his unflagging devotion to his work,) and his cultivated sons, especially Professor Isaac Lewis Peet, the present principal of this large and deservedly popular institution. Under the supervision of the latter, the work of simplifying the language of signs, and bringing it under the most natural and philosophical laws—of obviating the evil intellectual tendencies of such a language called "Deaf Muteism"—of securing more clearly the development of positive ideas, and leading the mind more rapidly to the understanding of the language of the land of its nativity and its grammatical structure—is constantly going on.

The relation of the sign-language to a spoken or written language, and its peculiar idiom, will be seen in the answer of Professor Keep, of Hartford, to the following question propounded by G. G. Hubbard, Esq., of Cambridge, Mass.: "Can you give me a few signs, with their translation into English, and also a short sentence in English, with its translation into the idiom of the sign-language?" To this the Professor returns the following answer:

I could describe to you the mode of making certain signs and explain their meaning, but I cannot write their ideas graphically, so as to exhibit them in a connected or sentence form. And in

attempting to translate an English sentence into signs, it must be always borne in mind that the English words employed to represent signs, whatever be their form, are not designed to express cases or tenses or moods. By the use of words we are able to give some idea of the order of the signs, and this is all. Mr. Turner has kindly handed me the story you sent him. I will first give a Latin version of it, and then show you what would be the order of signs, as well as I can present the same. From similarity in the arrangement and order of thoughts in the two languages, I trust you will see that one is no more a confused jargon than the other.

"A bear killed my father's geese; this made him mad. He shouldered his gun and went to look for the bear. When he discovered it he took a good position, fired, and killed the bear. The family were all very glad."

"Ursus patris anseres mei interfecit. Id eum iratum fecit. Sclopetum humero acclinavit et ivit ut ursum quæreret. Quum eum inveniret, loco bono occupato, telum misit et ursum occidit. Familia omnis erat lætissima."

In beginning the sign-version we make the sign for past time. Then, since signs require that the mode of killing should be true to nature and fact, we say "catch and eat" instead of kill. The story as rendered in signs will be: Bear, geese, father my his catch eat. Father angry very. Gun shoulder on, go look for bear. Discover. Place good stand. Fire. Bear die. Father, mother, children, all glad very.

To the question "What proportion of the exact ideas or words of a spoken sermon are actually translated into the sign language?" Professor Keep answered, "All the ideas; none of the words." And to the natural question, "How much of such a discourse is lost by the deaf mute hearers?" he responds: "Through inattention, preoccupation, or incapacity, as large a proportion may be lost by those who look upon the signs as by those who hear the voice."

Of the success of this vernacular of signs, as a means to introduce the more intelligent of this class of persons to a liberal culture in their own native literature and in other tongues, there are the most satisfactory evidences. In the high class in all the American institutions, good progress in advanced mathematics, metaphysics, the natural sciences, and the classics, gives annual assurance of this. The successful inauguration of a Collegiate Institution for the Deaf and Dumb at Washington, with a full curriculum of studies, the pupils having been "fitted" in State asylums, or in the preparatory school conducted on the same

principle, connected with the college, is another practical testimony to the same effect. The cultivated, intelligent, and very successful mute teachers employed in the different institutions for the deaf, the polished ladies, mothers of families, educated in these schools, as well as authors, editors, and artists, who have made their names to be known and honored in society by their ability, all conspire to show that the pantomimic language is a certain mediator between a soul shut out from the inspiration of the human voice and all human learning, and all possible mental and moral development. It ought in all fairness to be stated, however, that these advanced pupils are chiefly gathered from the class of semi-mutes—persons losing their hearing some years after birth.

But after all this has been accomplished, the cultivated mute is still excluded from society, and is an isolated being, only communicating with others, except the few that have learned his picturesque vernacular or the toilsome lettering of the hand, by the most wearisome process of writing; debarred from all enjoyment in the social circle, while the faces around him are glowing with pleasurable excitement, and cut off from the public lecture and the precious words that fall from the lips of the servant of God on the Sabbath day. Can this fearful chasm over the lost sense of hearing be so far bridged as to permit the soul, mutilated of one of its important members, once more to enjoy natural intercommunications with its fellows? All efforts (and they have been constantly repeated) to recall the finally deadened sense of hearing have proved failures. It is a singular fact that some of the earliest experiments in aid of the deaf mute were of the same nature as the last, and now earnestly pressed efforts in this country—to recover or to secure the power of articulation for the deaf pupil, and to enable him to read from a speaker's lips.

Three hundred years ago Pedro Ponce de Leon, a Spanish monk, born in the city of Valladolid, taught the two silent brothers and sister of the Constable of Castile, and probably others. Very few of the details of his system have been preserved, and we know not whether his most advanced pupils were born deaf, or lost their hearing after they had become somewhat familiar with spoken language. He says, however, of himself, that he taught persons who were deaf and dumb

from birth "to speak, to read, to write, to keep accounts, to repeat prayers, to serve the Mass, to know the doctrines of the Christian religion, and to confess themselves *viva voce*."

Thirty-six years after the death of Ponce, another Spaniard, John Paul Bonet, became not only a noted teacher of the deaf, but the author of the first important contribution to the literature of the subject. To him is attributed, probably without reason, as it was without much doubt of earlier invention, the construction of the manual alphabet.

In 1749, Jacob Rodrigues Pereira, a Spanish Jew, gave an exhibition of the school for deaf mutes which he had established six years before, in the presence of the Academy of Sciences at Paris. Of the results of his training the Committee say:

> The pupils were able to understand whatever was said to them, whether by signs or by writing, and replied, either *viva voce* or by writing. They could read and pronounce distinctly all sorts of French expressions; they gave very sensible replies to all questions proposed to them; they understood grammar and its applications; they knew the rules of arithmetic; and performed exercises in geography; and it appeared that Pereira had given them, with speech, the faculty of acquiring abstract ideas.*

It is difficult to see how the mere power to enunciate French words could have increased their ability to conceive of the qualities of objects any better than written language or the language of signs. Pereira, selfishly seeking of the Government an exorbitant sum for his secret of teaching articulation, although he had acquired a large property as an instructor, and being refused, permitted his process of instruction to die with him.

In 1648 an English physician, John Bulwer, published the first work, in this language, upon the instruction of mutes, entitled "Philcophos, or the Deafe and Dumbe Man's Friend," which has been followed by quite a voluminous literature. In this work he claims that "a man born Deafe and Dumbe may be taught to heare the sound of words with his eie, and thence learn to speak with his tongue."

The first Scotch and English institutions, established about 1760, five years before De l'Epée, under such noted instructors

* New American Encyclopædia.

as Henry Baker and the Braidwoods, gave special attention to articulation and little to the language of signs. Thomas Braidwood advertised that, at his academy in the city of Edinburgh, he taught the dumb to speak, and also cured impediments in the speech. One of his grandchildren, John, came to this country in the early years of this century, and opened a school for deaf mutes in Virginia. His intemperate habits, however, soon broke it up. According to the testimony of impartial observers these English schools did not compare in success with that of the French under De l'Epée and Sicard.

In the same year (1755) in which De l'Epée opened his school at Paris, Samuel Heinicke, of Weissenfels, a graduate of the University at Jena, became greatly interested in the instruction of a deaf mute boy in Dresden. In 1772 he opened a school for deaf mutes, with nine pupils, in the German city of Leipsic, the first institution established in that country, and existing in a flourishing condition at the present time. He was a man of pure and noble character, of lively religious sympathies, and lived a life consecrated to God and the service of suffering humanity. From the influence of a work of John Conrad Amman, a Swiss physician, residing at Haarlem, who had undertaken the instruction of a girl deaf and dumb from birth, entitled the "Speaking Deaf Man," Heinicke held and practiced upon the opinion that there is a necessary connection between the mental idea and the spoken word; and, in entire contradistinction from the French method of De l'Epée, he sought, without the intervention of signs, to instruct his pupils in articulation, and to enable them to read the speech of others from their lips. A large portion of the German-speaking nations of Europe have followed the same system; some of them, in later years, as have many of the English schools, have, more or less, modified this system by the introduction of the sign language in connection with articulation and lip-reading.

In 1843 Horace Mann, accompanied by Dr. S. G Howe, traveled through Europe, visiting the educational institutions, and among others, schools for the instruction of the deaf and dumb. In Mr. Mann's seventh report, as Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, he records the results of his visit, and ranks the German system of deaf and dumb training

above that of the American. This report induced the managers of the Hartford and the New York institutions to send an intelligent and expert observer, Dr. George E. Day, who had previously been connected with the latter institution, to make a thorough examination of these schools. Professor Day made two visits, in the years 1844 and 1859, carefully examining the most celebrated European institutions; but in his full and interesting reports, containing a valuable mass of very suggestive matter, he expresses, without hesitation, his preference for the American system, and his low estimate of the success attending the long and painful effort to secure the power of articulation and an ability to read from the lips of a speaker. He attributes the favorable impression made upon even cultivated minds, unfamiliar with the training of this class of persons, by the European system, to the fact that they usually witnessed only the remarkable performances of extraordinary and exceptional cases, upon whom a very long period of tuition had been expended, or who were, like many young speaking persons, children of genius. Professor Day's judgment, founded upon careful inquiry, is, that the great body of pupils in German schools are not as thoroughly educated, nor as far advanced, under their articulate training, as the same class in this country, by the use of the sign language, and that instruction in articulation and lip reading does not bestow, except upon a very small percentage of those trained in them, the power to communicate by language with others, or to hear public addresses.

In 1867 Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., son of the late distinguished first Principal of the American Institution at Hartford, himself President of the Columbia Institution and College at Washington, made an exhaustive examination of the most noted European institutions, giving particular attention to the subjects of articulation and lip reading. The result upon his mind was very similar to that upon the mind of Professor Day, except that he seems to have been somewhat more favorably impressed with the value of instruction in these branches for those mutes who had lost their hearing after having been accustomed for a time to a spoken language, and for congenital mutes manifesting a special aptitude for such tuition. With the great body of children deaf from birth, both these experienced observers esteem the period spent in teaching articula-

tion, which can never be of much practical service, as so much valuable time abstracted from the positive mental development and culture which can certainly be attained in the use of the sign language.

Dr. Gallaudet does ample justice, however, to the most favorable results attending the German system. He records, during his visit at Rotterdam, Holland, his remarkable interview with a pupil of Mr. Hirsch, director of the school in that city. He says:

Just as I was leaving Mr. Hirsch, after having held a long conversation with him, in which he urged with much earnestness, and even eloquence, the advantages of his system, a young man about twenty-five years of age entered, who was introduced to me as Mr. Edward Polano, the son of a physician, and who, with his sister, constituted the first class taught by Mr. Hirsch in Rotterdam. I was told that these persons were born totally deaf, and that they have never at any time gained the slightest power of hearing. Mr. Hirsch, in introducing Polano to me used the German language, and in telling him who I was, used the Dutch. As I shook hands with the young man I said, looking him full in the face, "Sprechen sie Deutsch?" His answer was promptly, "Ja wohl." Immediately I added, "Parlez-vous Français?" and his answer was as immediate, "Un peu." Without a moment's pause I added "Sprechen sie English?" He then hesitated a few seconds and then said distinctly "Very little," adding, with a smile, "This is a pleasant day: I am glad to see you," and saying in German that was the extent of his knowledge of English. Mr. Hirsch then retired to the other side of the room, a distance of some twenty feet, and speaking in a whisper, told young Polano in Dutch that my father was the first teacher of deaf mutes in America, that my mother was deaf and dumb, and that none of my brothers or sisters were deaf. Polano understood him perfectly and required no repetition. As I was under the necessity of parting from Mr. Hirsch at this time in order to take a train for Cologne, there was no further opportunity there for me to test Polano's powers of articulation and lip reading. But I asked him if he would not walk with me to my hotel, and he replied, "Mit vergnügen." I will give in English the greater part of what passed between us after starting on our walk, premising the remark that *all* our conversation was in *oral German*, without the use of a single sign. As we left the house of Mr. Hirsch, Polano said: "What hotel are you staying at?" I replied: "The hotel des Pays Bas." "O, I know it," said he. "Do you know my name?" he asked. "Yes," said I, "it is Polano." "That is right," said he, and we exchanged cards. "Do you not believe I was born deaf?" he inquired. "O yes," said I, and added immediately, "Do you talk with your sister by signs or with the

voice?" "With the voice," replied he; "I prefer it." "Isn't it very warm to-day?" said he. "Very warm," was my answer. Presently I remarked: "I think we are not going right, for my hotel." "O yes," said he, "we are right; did not you say you were stopping at the hotel des Pays Bas?" "Yes," I answered, "that is the name of my hotel." "Then we are quite right," said he, adding, "I live in Rotterdam, you remember, and know the city well." We walked on further, when, being quite sure we were going astray, I repeated that I feared we were wrong, adding that we were following quite a different course from that I took in going from my hotel, and asking if there were two hotels of the name Pays Bas in Rotterdam. He said he thought not; and so we kept on. Growing quite certain we were wrong, I stopped, and insisted we were not right, and said I feared I should be too late for the Cologne train if we did not reach my hotel soon. He seemed much troubled, and asked me if I would prefer to take a carriage. I said I would; and so we hailed a cab driver, and Polano asked him if there were two hotels des Pays Bas in Rotterdam. The cabman replied that there were, and mentioned that one was Adler's. I then remembered that was the name of the proprietor of my hotel, and so we jumped into the cab and told the driver to go to Adler's hotel des Pays Bas. Polano said as we rattled over the stones, in a voice that I perfectly understood, "I hope my mistake will not make you too late for your train; I did not know there were two hotels of the same name here." On reaching my hotel I paid my bill and got my luggage very hurriedly, and then we hastened on in the carriage to the railway station. On the way I took out my watch, and Polano said, "Is that an American watch?" On my replying in the affirmative he seemed much interested, and wanted to look at it. Just before we reached the railroad station I asked him how much I ought to pay the driver, and he said he thought one florin was quite enough. He asked me when I should come to Rotterdam again, and I said I hoped in a few years. I asked him when I should see him in America. This question I had to repeat a second time, when he replied, with a shrug, that it cost too much money; that perhaps by and by, when he was rich, he would go. I told him he must come to see me in Washington if he came to America. He replied he certainly would. As we reached the railroad station he said he hoped I would excuse him for making me so much trouble about getting to my hotel. As I handed a porter some money for taking my luggage he remarked, "You paid him too much." He accompanied me to the railroad carriage, and bid me good-bye, and in a moment the train moved. All this I have described was done in the greatest hurry. From the time I left Mr. Hirsch, Polano and I were either walking at a rapid pace through crowded streets, or riding over the pavements in a carriage, and yet what conversation we had was carried on with perfect ease, and without any resort whatever to the language of signs. The circumstances of

my interview with Polano were of such a nature as to induce me to accord cheerfully the merit of notable and praiseworthy success to Mr. Hirsch in this case; asking you, however, to bear in mind that the young man and his sister were private pupils of Mr. Hirsch during a period of eleven years, and were, therefore, in the enjoyment of advantages secured at a cost far beyond what can reasonably be demanded at the hands of public legislators or almoners of private benevolence in behalf of the great mass of deaf mutes, coming as they do from families of the poor.

The Massachusetts Board of State Charities, of which Dr. Howe is a member, in its very able reports for the last two or three years, and its late accomplished Secretary, F. B. Sanborn, have taken exceptions to the system of instruction pursued in the Hartford Institution, where, heretofore, the State had sent her mute children for education, and have strenuously advocated the training of her children at home upon the German system of articulation. Two interesting incidents brought to an unexpectedly early consummation their plans in this regard. The young daughter of a prominent and wealthy lawyer of Boston lost, through a severe attack of disease, her hearing. The afflicted and affectionate parents at once devoted themselves to the care of this beloved child, and sought to soften, as far as possible, the heavy blow that had fallen upon her. By unceasing care they enabled her to preserve her power of speech, and also to read their words from their lips, thus keeping her still in social fellowship with her friends, although unbroken silence reigned around her. Her eyes have been made to do double duty, and she hears with them as well as sees. Both sympathy and benevolence made this influential gentleman a warm advocate for the establishment of a State school, and for the use of articulation and lip-reading, as the chief means of training. He has since become an active Trustee in the first State Institution of Massachusetts.

Just at this time, Miss Harriet B. Rogers, a sister of the successful teacher of Laura Bridgeman and Oliver Caswell, blind mutes at the Institution for the Blind in Boston, had a deaf mute placed under her charge, to whom she taught articulation. Her success encouraged her to establish a school in 1866 in Chelmsford, Mass., where she soon collected seven scholars.

The marked success of her experiment, and the gift of fifty

thousand dollars from Mr. John Clarke, of Northampton, (since increased to two hundred thousand dollars on the death of the lamented donor,) induced the Legislature to establish the Clarke Institution for Deaf Mutes at Northampton, Mass. This has been placed in charge of Miss Rogers, with a corps of female assistants. Three annual reports have now been made. Of the nature and success of the school, the Trustees say, in their second report:

At the Clarke Institution, instruction in articulation and lip-reading is not pursued to the exclusion or the neglect of general education. One of the great merits of our system is, that general education is not only not neglected, but is greatly promoted by the course of instruction pursued. Even if it were true, that during the first two or three years the progress of the child is not so rapid as when taught by signs, (an admission we are by no means prepared to make,) yet instruction is commenced at a much earlier period. The time which would otherwise have been spent in idleness and ignorance is employed in overcoming the difficulties which attend the early stages of instruction, and before the age is reached when signs are usually first taught, the child is fairly started on a path of progress at once rapid and assured. There is no confusion of idioms to be overcome. The text-books are not in a foreign tongue, which must be translated into signs. After a course of equal length with that devoted to the hearing child, ten, twelve, or fifteen years, the progress of the deaf youth will compare not unfavorably with that of many of his more fortunate fellows.

Of the plan and progress of the institution under the care of Miss Rogers, as they strike a trained observer, a master of the French system, Dr. Peet remarks, in a report of a visit to her institution after it had been in operation about a year:

Miss Rogers does not profess to make articulation a chief end of instruction, (except in rare cases,) giving to exercises in that specialty only two hours daily. She admits that, as a general rule, they cannot be restored to society by means of articulation; that is, cannot share in a general conversation, or hold oral conversation with strangers, much less understand a sermon or public lecture. But she holds that they will be able to communicate by articulation and lip-reading with their immediate friends, who do not understand signs or the manual alphabet. That most of them may be able to do this may be conceded. . . . Miss Rogers holds that lip-reading is the best instrument of instruction for the deaf and dumb. She ardently desires and hopes to make words for them what they are to the semi-mutes as well as to those who hear, the direct representations of ideas and the medium of thought and reasoning.

Her success in this, Dr. Peet thinks, yet remains to be proved, with all the testimony in regard to European institutions against her. But it may be that American enthusiasm and perseverance in the instance of a peculiarly earnest woman will accomplish larger results than have been realized elsewhere. Of her wonderful success in one instance Dr. Peet bears honorable testimony:

I have spoken of the general unintelligibility of the utterances of these pupils at Northampton. I have to record three remarkable exceptions, Roscoe Green and Jerome H. Plummer, semi-mutes, and Etta Theresa B. Dudley, deaf from birth. The two former cases can be matched by some of our own pupils who speak intelligibly, and have accustomed themselves at home to read on the lips of their intimate friends. Miss Dudley is a rare and peculiar instance of success in teaching articulation and labial reading to the congenitally deaf. She had been taught through signs and the manual alphabet for a considerable time at home by Miss Edwards, a graduate of the American Asylum; by Miss Blauvelt, a graduate of the New York institution; had been two years at the Institution in Hartford, and had been under instruction by articulation at the Clarke Institution a little over a year. Her articulation was labored and slow, but intelligible. I saw and heard her converse with her mother at a distance of ten or twelve feet, and in a manner to be understood. When it is considered that she was thirteen years old when she came to school, having previously been taught to articulate a few words only, her case certainly presents one of the most remarkable examples of success in teaching articulation I ever heard or read of. From some rare peculiarity of temperament and mental organization she seems to prefer speech to signs. While her case shows what can be done in comparatively rare instances, it can by no means be taken as an indication of the average degree of success in this branch of instruction.

The Trustees of this school only encourage the entrance of pupils who did not lose their hearing until they had reached or advanced beyond the third year; or those born deaf, who have a peculiar aptitude for learning to speak; or, finally, those who can hear a little, but not clearly enough to attend a common school with profit. They suppose that about one half the whole number of deaf mutes would be embraced in these classes. The average of those in European schools who seem to be profited by this form of training is very much smaller than this.

The discussion of the comparative value of these two leading

systems, the French (for the American is based upon this) and the German, and the success of Miss Rogers in her new enterprise, have awakened much interest throughout the country. A small and quite successful school for articulation was established two or three years since in the city of New York by certain German gentlemen, employing Professor B. Engelsman, who was educated in a German institution, now very successfully developing his specialty, and teaching articulation in the New York State Institution, who has been succeeded in his private school by Mr. Resing, formerly a professor in the New York Institution. A school of the same character is to be established in the city of Boston, under the direction of its General School Committee. Nearly all the great State institutions in the country are now giving renewed attention to this matter, and in many instances have appointed well qualified instructors to devote their entire energies to this branch of training.

At a late Conference of the Principals of the American Institutions, held in Washington, after a thorough discussion of the question the following resolutions, as expressing their matured judgment, were passed with great unanimity:

Resolved, That the American system of deaf mute education, as practiced and developed in the institutions of this country for the last fifty years, commends itself by the best of all tests—that of prolonged, careful, and successful experiment—as in a pre-eminent degree adapted to relieve the peculiar misfortune of deaf mutes *as a class*, and restore them to the blessings of society.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Conference, it is the duty of all Institutions for the education of the Deaf and Dumb to provide adequate means for imparting instruction in articulation and lip-reading to such of their pupils as may be able to engage with profit in exercises of this nature.

Resolved, That, while in our judgment it is desirable to give semi-mutes and semi-deaf children every facility for retaining and improving any power of articulate speech they may possess, it is not profitable, except in promising cases, discovered after fair experiment, to carry congenital mutes through a course of instruction in articulation.

Resolved, That to attain success in this department of instruction an added force of instructors will be necessary, and this Conference hereby recommends to Boards of Directors of Institutions for the Deaf and Dumb in this country that speedy measures be taken to provide the funds needed for the prosecution of this work.

Art. VII.—THE METHODIST HYMN BOOK AND ITS ASSOCIATIONS.

A NEW work has just issued from the English press, entitled "The Methodist Hymn Book and its Associations. By GEORGE J. STEVENSON. With Notes, by the late Rev. W. M. Bunting, and an Introductory Poem by Benjamin Gough. London: 1870. Pp. 429." It has a London publisher, but is also advertised in the imprint to be "sold at 66 Paternoster Row," which is an indication that the British Conference either owns the work or has an interest in it, probably obtained since the author put his book to press. The "Notes" mentioned on the title-page are few, and not at all important, being only the transient memoranda of Mr. Bunting on the margin of his Hymn Book. The name of Mr. Bunting was evidently used merely to help the sale of the work. The preface is brief, occupying but two pages, and refers to the great blessing which Charles Wesley's hymns have been to the Church, and the frequency with which they have been triumphantly repeated by dying Christians. More than five hundred instances of this kind are given in the volume. The most of these are extracts from the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, and the rest from Methodist biographies. There are a few anecdotes from other sources. This may be considered the characteristic feature of the work, which the author hopes "may be deemed in some respects a not unworthy companion to those compositions."

The plan of the work is almost an exact imitation of Mr. Creamer's "Methodist Hymnology." The hymns in the Wesleyan Methodist Hymn Book—the first line of each—are given in consecutive order; then follows the original title; the name of the tune applied to the hymn in Mr. Wesley's "Sacred Harmony;" the author's name; the Scripture text, when there is one, on which the hymn is founded; the title of the work, and the year in which the hymn was first published; omissions and alterations of stanzas. Sometimes a short criticism or biographical sketch is given, and occasional illustrative passages from the English poets. Lastly, as stated above, follow examples of the use made of the hymns by departing saints.

The work is emphatically a compilation; there is little evi-

dence of, although there are some attempts at, originality, but considerable indications of industry in gathering up whatever has been written by others about the different hymns. In this regard, perhaps, no one work, except the Wesleyan Magazine, has been in more constant requisition than the "Methodist Hymnology;" indeed, Mr. Stevenson has publicly proclaimed himself a follower and student of Mr. Creamer in this department; and yet, strange to say, out of more than fifty instances of palpable quotation, in one case only, on page 184, does he deign to acknowledge his indebtedness.

It is a natural supposition, that nothing gives an author more satisfaction than to know that his writings are read and approved; but to withhold from him the credit due to the productions of his mental industry, and especially to see them adopted by another as his own, not only extracts the sense of pleasure, but leaves in its place a consciousness of the injustice that has been practiced upon him, and the wrong-doing of the offender. Some evidence of such conduct, we think, will appear in the following quotations from Mr. Stevenson's book.

Hymn 28:* "O Love divine! what hast thou done?"

It is a sweet and touching composition. Rev. Dr. Thomas O. Summers, of America, supposes that the refrain of this hymn, "My Lord, my Love, is crucified," is taken from Ignatius, martyr in the Primitive Church. The same line is found in J. Mason's "Songs of Praise," which appeared in 1683.—*Stevenson*, p. 24, *from Creamer*, p. 284.

Hymn 48: "Ah, lovely appearance of death!"

Caroline Bowles, who became the wife of Robert Southey, poet laureate, has written this passage:

> "And is this death? Dread thing!
> If such thy visiting,
> How beautiful thou art!"—*Stevenson*, p. 44.

Mrs. Hemans also has a similar passage:

"And is this death? Dread thing!" etc.—*Creamer*, p. 423.

Here Mr. Stevenson corrects Mr. Creamer as to the authorship of the lines from Miss Bowles, but omits the courtesy of mentioning the fact, while he adopts the passage.

Hymn 53: "Give glory to Jesus, our Head."

The poet has expressed an idea in the second verse which is worthy of remark; it is:

* The numbering is that of the *English* Hymn Book.

"Where glorified spirits, by sight,
Converse in their holy abode."

That intercourse should be carried on by sight, in the heavenly state, is certainly novel; and yet the same thought is stated in a passage by Butler in his Hudibras, which runs thus:

"Or, who, but lovers, can converse,
Like angels, by the eye discourse?
Address and compliment by vision."
Stevenson, p. 48; *from Creamer*, p. 441.

Hymn 103: "O that I could revere."

This striking figure of speech ["Show me the naked sword, Impending o'er my head,"] is taken from the story of Damocles, as related by Cicero of Dionysius, King of Italy, and one of his flatterers, B. C. 368, etc. The Rev. Joseph Stennett employs the same figure thus:

"Who laughs at sin, laughs at his Maker's frowns,
Laughs at the sword of vengeance o'er his head."
Stevenson, p. 79; *from Creamer*, p. 246.

In this instance the use made of the story of Damocles was not original with either Mr. Creamer or Mr. Stevenson, but is a quotation from a work on "Wesleyan Hymnology" by the late W. P. Burgess, to whom Mr. Creamer gives due credit. The illustrative passage from Stennett was used originally by Mr. Creamer.

Hymn 117: "God is in this and every place."

There is a singular coincidence deserving of notice in this as well as in another of Charles Wesley's hymns. The first two verses read thus:

"And have I measured half my days,
And half my journey run,
Nor tasted the Redeemer's grace,
Nor yet my work begun?

"The morning of my life is past,
The noon is almost o'er;
The night of death approaches fast,
When I can work no more."

When these lines were written their author was in his fortieth year; he died aged eighty. How did he obtain the knowledge that he had measured half his days?—*Stevenson*, p. 86; *from Creamer*, p. 244.

Hymn 128: "With glorious clouds encompass'd round."

The sentiment conveyed in the first verse is also contained in the first verse of Hymn 130. The line, "Whom angels dimly see," seems to have been suggested by a similar expression of Milton's:

"Who sittest above these heavens,
To us invisible, or dimly seen!"

Samuel Wesley, Jun., in Hymn 561, has the following couplet:

"In light unsearchable enthroned,
Whom angels dimly see!"—*Stevenson*, p. 89.

A hymn in the poet's most impassioned strain; although the thought in the first, and repeated in the last stanza, and perhaps the expression, belong to Milton.

Hymn 132: "Jesus, the sinner's Friend, to thee."

The strong language used in the third verse,

"Tread down thy foes, with power control
The beast and devil in my soul,"

the Wesleys and Whitefield learned from Bishop Hall and William Law. Southey, in his "Life of Wesley," relates the story of a merry-andrew who attended the preaching of Whitefield, and made a most indecent exposure of his person. Whitefield himself was for a moment confounded with such a spectacle, but recovering himself, he appealed to his audience whether he had wronged human nature in saying, with Bishop Hall, that man when left to himself is half a fiend and half a brute; or in calling him, with William Law, a motley mixture of the beast and devil.—*Stevenson*, p. 91; *from Creamer*, p. 249.

Hymn 155: "God of my life, what just return."

These stanzas, (referring to several omitted from the Hymn Book, but inserted in Mr. Creamer's work,) in sublimity of thought, and strength of expression, surpass Addison's fine hymn written under similar circumstances, which commences, "When rising from the bed of death," etc.—*Stevenson*, p. 102; *from Creamer*, p. 252.

Hymn 163: "When, gracious Lord, when shall it be."

The idea contained in the second verse, "O dark! dark! dark! I still must say," is similar to a line in Milton's Samson Agonistes, line eighty, as follows: "O dark! dark! dark! amid the blaze of noon."—*Stevenson*, p. 106.

The second stanza,

"A poor blind child I wander here,
If haply I may feel Thee near:
O dark! dark! dark! I still must say,
Amidst the blaze of Gospel day!"

is an imitation of Milton in Samson Agonistes, where he puts the following language in the mouth of Samson:

"But chief of all,
O loss of sight, of thee I most complain!
Blind among enemies. . . .
O dark! dark! dark! amid the blaze of noon,
Irrecoverably dark, total eclipse,
Without all hope of day."—*Creamer*, p. 267.

Hymn 224: "I'll praise my Maker while I've breath."

The first line John Wesley has altered from "I'll praise my Maker *with my* breath;" and verse three in the original reads thus:

"The Lord hath eyes to give the blind,
The Lord supports the sinking mind."

The thought of the poet in the third verse seems to be borrowed from "Pope's Messiah:"

"All ye blind, behold!
He from thick films shall purge the visual ray,
And on the sightless eyeball pour the day."
—*Stevenson*, p. 146; *from Creamer*, p. 319.

Hymn 229: "God of my life, to thee."

The singular idea in the last two lines,

"Like Moses to thyself convey,
And kiss my raptured soul away!

is founded on a tradition among the Jews, that the Almighty drew the soul or spirit of Moses out of his body by a kiss. Dr. Watts, in his Lyric Poems on the death of Moses, gives the same idea thus:

"Softly his fainting head he lay
Upon his Maker's breast!
His Maker kissed his soul away,
And laid his flesh to rest."
—*Stevenson*, p. 150; *from Creamer*, p. 408.

Hymn 231: "Away with our fears! The glad morning appears."

Few persons besides the Brothers Wesley could say of friends what Charles Wesley says in one of the omitted verses:

"How rich in friends, Thy providence sends,
To help my infirmity on!
What a number I see, Who could suffer for me,
And ransom my life with their own."
—*Stevenson*, p. 151; *from Creamer*, p. 408.

Hymn 262: "A thousand oracles divine."

Dr. Edward Young, in his "Night Thoughts," has the following, which exactly corresponds with the seventh verse of this fine hymn:

"They see on earth a bounty not indulged on high,
And downward look for heaven's superior praise!"
—*Stevenson*, p. 159; *from Creamer*, p. 301.

Hymn 276: "Worship, and thanks, and blessing."

Men who could thus suffer and thus sing were as ready for the "lions' den," or the "fiery furnace," as for the infuriated madness of men and beasts.—*Stevenson*, p. 166.

Men who could suffer and thus sing would, under similar circumstances, be as ready as Daniel to be cast into "the lions'" den, or to enter, like the three Hebrew children, the "fiery furnace," even though it were heated seven times hotter than usual.—*Creamer*, p. 439.

Hymn 323: "God of almighty love."

In the third verse of the original the first line is, "Spirit of grace, inspire," and the last line is, "A worm into a god." The alterations are to be preferred; but the idea conveyed in the last line exactly corresponds with a passage in the first book of Young's "Night Thoughts:"

"How poor, how rich, how abject, how august,
How complicate, how wonderful is man!
* * * * *
Midway from nothing to the Deity!
A beam ethereal, sullied and absorpt!
Though sullied and dishonored, still divine!
Dim miniature of greatness absolute!
An heir of glory, a frail heir of dust!
Helpless immortal, insect infinite!
A worm! a god!"

Young, as a poet, was a favorite with the Wesleys; but probably both Young and the Wesleys had in their minds the recollection of the words of the Saviour: "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods."—*Stevenson*, p. 179; *from Creamer*, p. 275.

Hymn 340: "The thing my God doth hate."

There is a remarkable thought in the third verse, "Soul of my soul." "Christ and the true believer become, as it were, identified; for he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." Sir Richard Blackmore has the same thought in his "Ode to the Divine Being:"

"Blesed object of my love intense,
I thee my joy, my treasure call,
My portion, my reward immense,
Soul of my soul, my life, my all."
—*Stevenson*, p. 196; *from Creamer*, p. 333.

Hymn 344: "Thou hidden love of God, whose height."

John Wesley, in his "Plain Account of Christian Perfection," records that he wrote (translated) this hymn while at Savannah, Georgia, in the year 1736; and he quotes the line in verse four commencing, "Is there a thing beneath the sun," to show his religious sentiments at that period. Dr. Southey, confusing dates, gives the affection for Grace Murray as the origin of this hymn. Mr. B. Love, in his "Records of Wesleyan Life," describes this hymn as the pious contemplation of a soul seeking for full redemption. In a translated "Life of Tersteegen," by the Rev. Samuel Jackson, a version of this hymn is given with two stanzas, the fourth and fifth, more than John Wesley had translated.—*Stevenson*, p. 199; *from Creamer*, p. 334.

In the above extract Mr. Stevenson misinterprets Mr. Creamer's words, and accuses Dr. Southey of "confusing dates," and thereby falling into an error concerning Mr. John Wesley's love affair, while in Georgia, with Miss Sophia Hop

kins.* There is no mistake. Dr. Southey is correct; he does not refer to Grace Murray, as asserted by Mr. Stevenson. Does not Mr. Stevenson know that Mr. Wesley's "affection for Grace Murray" was his second essay in unsuccessful courtship? And his "affection," not for "Grace Murray," but for Miss Sophy, as Mr. Wesley frequently calls her, was doubtless, as Dr. Southey believed, the "thing striving to share his heart," alluded to in the stanza of the hymn, which runs thus:

"Is there a thing beneath the sun
That strives with thee my heart to share?
Ah! tear it thence, and reign alone,
The Lord of every motion there!"

The time and circumstances when the hymn was written all conspire to justify the supposition of Dr. Southey. To give up Miss Sophy was the greatest trial of his life up to that time.

Hymn 390: "Since the Son hath made me free."

Here a great blunder has been committed by Mr. Stevenson by inserting under this hymn the remarks intended to accompany the next three hymns, namely, Nos. 391, 392, 393.

The whole of this hymn (comprising the above three hymns) may be found at the end of Mr. Wesley's fortieth sermon, the subject of which is "Christian Perfection." It was a great favorite with both John Wesley and John Fletcher, who made good use of it in their controversies with the opponents of the doctrine of sanctification. Mr. Fletcher, in his "Last Check to Antinomianism," says of his opponent's antagonism to the doctrine, "It doubtless chiefly springs from his inattention to our definition of it, which I once more sum up in these comprehensive lines of Mr. Wesley." Then follow the lines of this hymn.—*Stevenson*, p. 221; *from Creamer*, p. 347.

Mr. Stevenson is singularly unfortunate when he attempts to alter or correct another's text, as already shown in regard to Dr. Southey. This is another instance. Mr. Fletcher, in the above extract from his "Last Check," does not refer to the whole "hymn" of Wesley, but only to the following verse, the "lines" of which he quotes:

"O let me gain perfection's height!
O let me into nothing fall!
And less than nothing in thy sight,
And feel that Christ is all in all!"

* Not Causton—this was her uncle's name, with whom she lived; hence the error of Mr. Wesley's biographers as to her true name.

Hymn 428: "Let Him to whom we now belong."

The self-consecration expressed in this and the previous hymn is, as Dr. Brevint remarks, inclusive of all which we are, and which we can give to God, even to the least vessel in our houses; all are made holy in this one consecration.—*Stevenson*, p. 234; *from Creamer*, p. 338.

Hymn 433: "Give me the faith which can remove."

In the second verse the poet breathes "a strong desire" for "a calmly fervent zeal,

> 'To save poor souls out of the fire,
> To snatch them from the verge of hell;
> And turn them to a pard'ning God,
> And quench the brands in Jesus' blood.'"

Pollok, in his "Course of Time," has a passage which has a strong resemblance to these lines, (B. II, l. 157:)

> "The Holy One for sinners dies;
> The Lord of life for guilty rebels bleeds;
> Quenches eternal fire with blood divine."
> —*Stevenson*, p. 236; *from Creamer*, p. 391.

Hymn 468: "God only wise, almighty, good."

This fine and practical hymn inculcates some really invaluable lessons for the proper government of a family. The "sacred clew" of the fourth verse, which guides persons in a labyrinth, and keeps them in the right way, is especially striking and suggestive. —*Stevenson*, p. 246; *from Creamer*, p. 405.

Hymn 524: "Our friendship sanctify and guide."

This hymn was specially written by the poet for himself and his brother, which will at once account for the personal character of the phraseology.—*Stevenson*, p. 265; *from Creamer*, p. 383.

Hymn 552: "Jesus drinks the bitter cup."

The long and interesting note on this hymn is from a valuable work on "Wesleyan Hymnology," by the late W. P. Burgess, who gives an account from Plutarch concerning a singular circumstance that transpired during the reign of Tiberius, Emperor of Rome, in the Ionian Sea at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, when a voice was heard exclaiming, "The great Pan is dead." This fine classical allusion is quoted at great length in "Methodist Hymnology," whence, if not directly from Mr. Burgess, it was copied by Mr. Stevenson.

Hymn 564: "Infinite God, to thee we raise."

This paraphrase has been very generally ascribed to the poet Dryden, but erroneously. He has published a version of this fine

hymn, but it is much inferior to this one by Charles Wesley. His is in the decasyllabic verse, and commences thus:

"Thee, sovereign God, our grateful accents praise;
We own thee, Lord, and bless thy wond'rous ways."
—*Stevenson*, p. 287; *from Creamer*, p. 462.

Hymn 579: "Great is the Lord our God."

In one of the omitted stanzas, Dr. Watts has shown most convincingly how the power of the Almighty is the defense of any nation that trusts in him:

"When navies, tall and proud,
Attempt to spoil our peace,
He sends his tempests roaring loud,
And sinks them in the seas."

[Not "roaming round," as Mr. Stevenson has it in the third line.]

Similar in sentiment is that line of Charles Wesley's in which he prays for the defeat of the French navy. When that nation was seeking to invade England, Charles Wesley's prayer for the intruding invaders was very pointed:

"Sink them in the Channel, Lord!"
—*Stevenson*, p. 291; *from Creamer*, p. 446.

Hymn 583: "Again our weekly labors end."

This is part of a hymn of fourteen stanzas, originally written by Joseph Stennett, and published in 1732. It has been so altered by some one, that, as it appears in the Methodist collection, only the last five lines are copied in their integrity. The first verse reads thus:

"Another six days' work is done;
Another Sabbath is begun:
Return, my soul, unto thy rest;
Revere the day thy God has blest."
—*Stevenson*, p. 295; *from Creamer*, p. 410.

Hymn 630: "Hail the day that sees Him rise."

The poet had a great liking to the word "pomp," if we may judge from the frequency of its occurrence in his hymns. He takes care, however, not to use it in a loose, indiscriminate manner, but seems ever to have his eye upon the original import. It was a religious word among the Greeks, and was used by them to denote a religious procession. Accordingly, the poet, in verse 2 of this hymn, says, "There the pompous triumph waits;" and in other places, "And lead the pompous triumph on," "By the pomp of thine ascending."—*Stevenson*, p. 317; *from Creamer*, p. 435.

Hymn 689: "Jesu, my God and King."

The original has eleven verses. In the ninth verse the poet describes the expulsion of Lucifer from heaven in these emphatic words:

"Lucifer as lightning fell,
Far from heaven, from glory far,
Headlong hurl'd to deepest hell!"—*Stevenson*, p. 343.

Verse 9 contains a fine description of the expulsion of the rebel angel from heaven. The expression in the last line,

"Headlong hurl'd to deepest hell,"

is particularly striking, sense and sound being as admirably combined as in any passage of our best English poets; while the alliteration in three out of five words gives the line a finish that is exquisite, and almost inimitable:

"Thee, when the Dragon's pride,
To battle vain defied,
Brighter than the Morning Star,
Lucifer, as lightning, fell
Far from heaven, from glory far,
Headlong hurl'd to deepest hell!"—*Creamer*, p. 447.

Hymn 713: "Wisdom ascribe, and might, and praise."

There are few more beautifully sublime passages in Charles Wesley's hymns than the fourth stanza of this one, which is omitted. The idea of the poet is that of a sinner weighed in the "balance" of the Gospel and found wanting: the beam begins to preponderate, a soul is about to topple into hell; but, hark! the "remnant" (Rom. ix, 27) are praying, the Holy Ghost is groaning, the Son interceding, the Father becomes propitious, and the swift-winged angel of mercy executes his commission by touching the quivering scale, and, lo! that soul is saved.

"Still in the doubtful balance weigh'd,
We trembled, while the remnant pray'd;
The Father heard his Spirit groan,
And answer'd mild, It is my Son!
He let the prayer of faith prevail,
And mercy turn'd the hov'ring scale."
—*Stevenson*, p. 350; *from Creamer*, p. 455.

In reference to the above verse, and the previous description, Mr. Stevenson says, "Those who remember the late William Dawson will recognize in them the outline of one of that eminent man's most powerful and impressive discourses, 'The Windlass.'" If Mr. Stevenson be correct, the coincidence of Mr. Creamer, who has never visited England, reproducing the skeleton of one of Mr. Dawson's most celebrated discourses seven years after his death, and at the distance of three thousand miles, is indeed remarkable; but it ought not to prevent

the American author from receiving at the hands of his English brother hymnologist the usual courtesy of an honest recognition. Can Mr. Stevenson furnish the evidence of the correctness of his assertion? Without meaning to impeach his veracity, we may say, that in a somewhat careful stroll through Mr. Everett's very able and full biography of Mr. Dawson we have failed to find any reference to the incident in question. Mr. Everett quotes many lines and stanzas of his hero's favorite hymns, and mentions the titles of some of his most popular missionary and other discourses, as "The Telescope," "The Railroad," "The Musical Clock," "The Reform Bill," "The British Lion," and others; but there is no mention of "The Windlass," nor of the stanza. As Mr. Stevenson professes to give the facts concerning this matter from recollection, we would remind him that Mr. Dawson died more than twenty-eight years ago, and his Memoirs appeared the following year, when all the circumstances connected with his "most powerful and impressive discourses" were fresh in the mind of his faithful biographer. It seems to us that, taking the above stanza and accompanying remarks as expressive of the character of the sermon, the more appropriate title would be, "The Scales," or "The Balance," both of these words being used in the lines quoted from Wesley. But there is nothing in them, nor the foregoing description, that to our mind is at all suggestive of a "Windlass." Is it not just possible that in this instance, as in that of Dr. Southey and Grace Murray, Mr. Stevenson's judgment is at fault?

Hymn 718: "I call the world's Redeemer mine."

By adopting the erroneous translation of the passage put forth in what is called the authorized version of the Scriptures, Mr. Wesley has fallen into the generally received error, "Though after my skin worms destroy this body," etc. (Job xix, 26.) The poet says,

"And though the worms this skin devour;"

and again in the fourth verse,

"Then let the worms demand their prey."

Dr. Watts has the same idea in Hymn 721; and Hart, in one of his hymns, embodies the same opinion. In Hymn 726 the same idea is found; but the opinion is not found in the original Scriptures, nor is it a recognized physical fact that worms destroy the bodies of the dead."—*Stevenson*, p. 355; *from Creamer*, p. 456.

Hymn 759: "O Thou that hangedst on the tree."

Yet of these even (the conversion of condemned malefactors) he (Charles Wesley) has left evidence of the resene of many; and in this hymn the great cardinal doctrine of our holy religion, FAITH, is clearly stated and strongly enforced.—*Stevenson*, p. 385; *from Creamer*, p. 461.

Hymn 213: "My God, the spring of all my joys."

This hymn, says Milner in his "Life of Watts," "is almost without spot or blemish, if we except the last line of verse 4, which was amended by John Wesley." "T'embrace my dearest Lord," wrote Watts. Wesley made other improvements in the hymn. An able critic in the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine says of this hymn that "it is the very best Watts wrote, and breathes the intense earnestness, and passionate, kindling fervor of Wesley himself. It is an effusion of irrepressible joy and triumphant faith."—*Stevenson*, p. 137; *from Creamer*, p. 317.

Hymn 334: "Lord, I adore thy gracious will."

Dr. Adam Clark gives frequent commendation of the poetry of Charles Wesley in his Notes on the Bible; and on this short hymn the discriminating critic makes these observations in his notes on this passage of Holy Writ: "No soul of man can suppose that ever God bade one man to curse another, much less that he commanded such a wretch as Shimei to curse such a man as David," etc.—*Stevenson*, p. 189; *from Creamer*, p. 197.

Hymn 507: "Saviour of all, to thee we bow."

A writer in the "Southern Methodist Quarterly," vol. ii, (American,) remarking on this hymn, says, "As faith is a receiving and appropriating, not a bestowing or imparting grace, there have been objections to the line, 'The heavenly manna faith imparts.'"—*Stevenson*, p. 262; *from Creamer*, p. 380.

The above extracts are composed partly of original thoughts, and partly, as will be observed, of quotations from other authors; but the precise language of neither is on all occasions adopted. Sometimes there are slight variations of expression, and occasionally additions or omissions of parts of sentences; but in every instance the substance of the passages quoted is given, so that they can at once be identified, and ought to have been acknowledged.

There are many other similar, though not so palpable, cases as most of the above of what must be considered outright plagiarism. An examination of the remarks which accompany the following hymns, 25, 43, 49, 330, 437, 503, 529, 592, 728, in the

work of Mr. Stevenson, and the same hymns in that of Mr. Creamer numbered 195, 551, 558, 404, 510, 415, 453, 377, 539, will show a most extraordinary identity of thought and research in the prosecution and recorded results of their respective studies. The fact, however, that Mr. Creamer's work has been before the public for more than twenty years seems to give it a claim to originality and credit in such cases, except where they are clearly instances of accidental concurrence, or of independent investigation.

There are numerous other instances of want of candor, and evidences of carelessness and inefficiency in the work. It is stated on page 41, that Samuel Wesley, Jun.'s, hymn, "The morning flowers display their sweets," was first published by John Wesley in 1743, instead of by the author in 1736. On page 47, "Samuel *Hutchings*" for Hitchings; on page 48, "*Oh*, who," for Or, who; on page 116, "Miss *Winkler*" for Winkworth; and on pages 301 and 324, "rhythm" for rhyme. The hymn,

"When shall thy love constrain,"

which, in the Wesleyan collection, includes both the 424th and 428th of the present Methodist Episcopal Hymn Book, is thus noticed by Mr. Stevenson: "This is a great favorite with the people, probably arising from the simplicity of the language. Like many of the poet's hymns, the rhythm of this is occasionally imperfect." We have looked in vain for the "imperfect rhythm" of which Mr. Stevenson speaks, and which, in fact, does not exist, neither in this hymn, nor in the "many" others to which he so recklessly alludes. It is a palpable slander upon the prince of sacred lyric poets. The last six stanzas constitute that touchingly tender "penitential cry,"

"And can I yet delay My little all to give?
To tear my soul from earth away For Jesus to receive?"

which has so often cheered our hearts in the days of our "godly sorrow," and caused it to "flee away."

Charles Wesley's sublime Christmas trumpet-call,

"Hark! the herald angels sing,—
Glory to the new-born King,"

is one of the few hymns which are printed at the end of the New Version of the metrical Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of England. By what

means it got there has of late troubled and puzzled the muddled brain of many a wiseacre to find out, and among the number must be classed the author of the work under consideration. Mr. Stevenson, taking his cue from Pearson's Oxford Essays, a High Church publication, foolishly enough says, "The only reasonable way of accounting for the remarkable circumstance is, that on one occasion the University printer, having a blank page in the Prayer Book, put in the hymn without either knowing its author, or asking any one's authority for so doing; and once having a place there it is almost impossible to displace it, an act which has been contemplated by some Churchmen since its author has become generally known."

The Churchmen's object is to depreciate the name and fame of the Wesleys, by spreading the idea that nothing written by them was ever authorized or approved by *The Church.* We believe the hymn was inserted in the Prayer Book not by accident, but because of its appropriateness and surpassing excellence; and it is simply disgraceful for a professed Wesleyan, in an authorized work, to second the mean efforts of the enemies of Methodism to injure and dishonor the character of its founders.

The British reader will consult in vain the text of his English copy of Dr. Southey's Life of Wesley, referred to on page 92, as that reference is to Harper's American edition of that work, as quoted by Mr. Creamer, and copied unconsciously by Mr. Stevenson. It does not often happen that the plagiarist advertises so conspicuously his literary purloinings.

The present is a proper occasion to notice and condemn the too prevalent practice of literary larceny. The brain work of authors is held fair game for the literary poacher; and some authors and compilers act toward their brothers of the craft in total obliquity of the teaching of both the eighth and tenth precepts of the decalogue. How a follower of Him whose name is Love, and whose character is Truth, can commit such unrighteous deeds, is something that involves a question not easily understood, but of doubtful propriety.

That Mr. Stevenson should fail to notice the valuable work of Rev. W. P. Burgess on "Wesleyan Hymnology," either in the preface or body of his book, although it is very evident he made frequent and important use of it, is not only remarkable,

but reprehensible. Mr. Burgess was a pioneer in hymnological lore in England, and for his talents and piety, which were ever usefully employed during a long life, he deserves to be held in respectful remembrance.

Mr. Creamer was likewise the first American author who made the study of Methodist Hymnology a specialty, and for more than a quarter of a century he has ardently prosecuted his favorite pursuit. His work on this subject appeared in 1848, and is still read and appreciated by the lovers of sacred lyric poetry; a subject that is attracting much attention in both countries, and whose admirers are daily increasing. Such works are not to be ignored nor depreciated by any slights which Mr. Stevenson may cast upon them, whatever may be the reason for his censurable conduct.

As indicative of the growing taste and demand for hymnic literature, may be mentioned the publication, by the British Conference, of the complete poetical works of John and Charles Wesley, which are now passing through the London press, and are to be finished in twelve volumes. These will comprise not only all their poetical works which have hitherto issued from the press, but also all the poems and hymns left in manuscript by Charles Wesley at his death. The last four volumes will be composed of these new treasures.

The accomplishment of this great enterprise, which will be completed during the present year, will have the effect not merely to meet in part the increased demand for this kind of reading, but to revive the works of Messrs. Burgess, Holland, and Creamer, and to bring into more general circulation the cognate works of Mesdames Charles, Cox, and Winkworth, and Messrs. Miller, Christophers, Macdonald, Schaff, Saunders, and others. The untrodden field of literature first entered a quarter of a century ago by the authors of "Wesleyan" and "Methodist Hymnology," and which long seemed sterile and unproductive, has at length yielded to modern intellectual husbandry, and the product has been flowers of the sweetest perfume, and fruits of the richest flavor. The harvests already gathered in this department assure the present laborers that their future will be rewarded in the scriptural proportions of thirty, sixty, and a hundred fold.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

The Roman Council.—On the 24th of April the Vatican Council confirmed and promulgated the first of the dogmatic decrees which it has under discussion. It is entitled a Dogmatic Decree on Catholic Faith. (*Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide.*) The first draft of it was placed in the hands of the Bishops early in December. After some weeks of private study it was taken up for discussion in the general congregation, held on the 28th of December. At the conclusion of the discussion the draft was referred for emendations to the special committee or deputation on matters of faith, to which were also sent full reports of all the discourses in the discussion. This committee had many meetings, went over the whole matter two or three times, heard the authors of the draft, divided it into two parts, and reported back the first part amended, containing an introduction and four chapters, with canons annexed. This new and revised draft or *schema*, so presented to the Bishops, was again submitted to a renewed discussion and examination—first in general on its plan as a whole, and then by parts. The speeches were very brief, only one of them exceeding half an hour, and several not lasting more than five minutes. All who wished to propose further amendments or changes were required to hand them in in writing. When at length the discussion on any special part was terminated, that portion of the *schema*, and all the proposed amendments, were again referred to the committee. The amendments were printed, and a few days after, in a general congregation, the whole matter would come up for a vote. The committee announced which of the amendments they had accepted, and briefly stated the reasons for which they were unwilling to accept the others. The Bishops then voted on each amendment singly, unless it were withdrawn by its author by a rising vote. It is said that in the discussion of this *schema de fide*, the majority was on every vote so preponderating that an actual count was not necessary, and that only once the Bishops were nearly evenly divided, the important question happening to be whether the insertion of a certain comma between two words in the text would make the sense more distinct or not. When the introduction, and each one of the chapters, with the accompanying canons, had thus been separately passed on, the entire *schema*, as a whole, was submitted to the fathers for a more solemn and decisive vote in the general congregations held on April 12 and April 19. The vote on this occasion was taken by ayes and noes. This was first done in the congregation on the 12th of April in the following manner: The secretary, from the pulpit, called the prelates one after the other, according to their ranks, and their seniority in their several ranks, naming each one by his ecclesiastical title. The cardinals presiding were called first, the other cardinals next, then the patriarchs, the primates, the archbishops, the bishops, the mitred abbots, and the superiors of the various religious orders and congregations having solemn vows. As each Bishop was called, he rose in his place, bowed to the assembly, and voted. The form was *placet*, if he approved entirely; *placet juxta modum*, if there were any minor points which he was unwilling to approve; or *non placet*, if he disapproved. In the second case, he handed in a written statement of his opinion and vote on that point, and assigned the reasons which moved him to this special view. The assessors of the Council received these manuscripts, and delivered them to the presiding legates. As the name of each one was called, if not present, he was marked absent; if present, and voting, two or three of the officials, stationed here and there in the hall, repeated with clear voices the form of words used by the prelates in voting, so that all might hear them, and that no mistake could be committed as to any one's vote. The whole procedure occupied about two hours. When it was over, the votes were counted before all, and the result declared. The special matter urged in the written and conditional votes were again, and for the last time, examined by the committee or deputation on matters of faith, who reported the result of their discussion in the congregation of April 19, and the precise form of words was settled to be decreed, and published in the third public ses-

sion, which was held on Low Sunday, April 26.

The above account is abridged from the statement of an American priest, (Father Hecker,) who has himself been called to Rome to participate in the labors of the Council. This writer makes no mention whatever of the grave dissensions which are said to have shown themselves even with regard to this point. Other papers, in particular the famous Roman letters of the "Augsburg Gazette," have given the most minute accounts of these dissensions, in particular of a profound excitement which is said to have been produced by Bishop Strossmayer, the most famous name of the opposition. But though it is certain that these accounts are not entirely groundless, it is, with the information as yet accessible to us, impossible to find out to what extent false rumors may be mixed up with the truth, and this, and many other portions of the Council's secret history, must wait for future disclosures.

The official text of the first dogmatic decree of the Vatican Council has already been published. The first impression this document will make upon probably every one outside of the Roman Catholic Church is an astonishment that a meeting of eight hundred and more Bishops should have spent four months in elaborating an essay which many Roman Catholic theologians would have been able to furnish fully as good, if not better, in less than a week. It sets out in an introduction with a description of the good results which have flowed from the Council of Trent, and then turns to the evils which have followed the Reformation. The rejection of the authority of the Church has been followed, the decree says, by the principle of subjecting all things belonging to religion to the judgment of each individual. Thus the original heresies have been broken up into many sects, which differed among themselves, and finally all belief in Christ was overthrown in the minds of not a few, and the sacred Scriptures began to be counted among myths and fables. Then arose the doctrines of Rationalism or Naturalism; and at last the minds of many have fallen into the abyss of Pantheism, Materialism, and Atheism. Not a few even of the children of the Roman Catholic Church have wandered from the true path, wherefore the Pope deems it necessary to profess and declare, in common with the Bishops assembled in Œcumenical Council, from the chair of St. Peter, the saving doctrine of Christ. Then follow the four "chapters." Chapter i, of God the Creator of all things; chapter ii, of revelation; chapter iii, of faith; chapter iv, of faith and reason. To these are added eighteen anathemas against certain heretical opinions concerning these new doctrines. The greater part of the chapters treats on subjects on which Roman Catholics and the Eastern Churches and orthodox Protestant agree against those who deny the Christian revelation; but their common ground is not defined in a manner in any way superior to the many excellent apologetic treatises in which both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant literature abounds. The Roman Catholic laity takes little notice of, and little interest in, such questions; and if the Council had not awaiting its decision some topic of much greater importance, the interest in its progress would soon subside.

But this *schema* on faith is immediately followed by the great question, and, in fact, almost the only question, which secures to the Council a general interest, that of Papal Infallibility. The interest in this question has considerably increased, both within and without the Roman Catholic Church, during the last three months. In fact, it has secured the attention of the civilized world to an unwonted degree. Almost all religious and secular papers, with many thousands of pamphlets and books, have discussed the question in all its aspects. The opinions of the Roman Catholics concerning this question widely differ. A paper, which defends the truth of Papal Infallibility, but doubts the opportuneness of defining it as a dogma, says, that with regard to this question seven parties may be distinguished within the Church. *First:* Those who regard the belief in Papal Infallibility as a necessity, treat the contrary view as heretical, demand a dogmatical promulgation, and seek to promote the latter by all just and many unjust means. Many writers of the Jesuit order, especially those who write for the chief organ of the Ultramontane party, the *Civilta Cattolica* of Rome, are counted with this class. *Second:* Those who desire the promulgation of the doctrine, but who respect all who oppose it up to the time of the dogmatical definition, as good Catholics. The Bishops who have signed the *postulatum* for the doctrine belong partly to this,

partly to the preceding class. *Third:* Those who personally accept the truth of the doctrine, but deny or doubt the opportuneness of declaring it as an article of faith. It is claimed that the majority of the Bishops who belong to the Opposition of the Council, especially the German, Austrian, and French Bishops, share this view. The *fourth* class, which comprises the immense majority of the Catholic people, have formed no personal opinion either for or against the doctrine, but confidently leave everything to the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, who, they believe, will guard the Council from falling into any doctrinal error. The *fifth* class have thus far been unable to convince themselves of the truth of the Infallibility doctrine, but they are ready to accept submissively and cheerfully any decision of the Council whatever it may be. The *sixth* comprises those opponents of Infallibility who regard their view as so irrefutable that they would be tempted to doubt the œcumenical character of a Council which should promulgate such a doctrine, and to repudiate its decisions. Döllinger, it is thought, must be put in this class, and with him many of the prominent scholars who have signed congratulatory and sympathetic addresses to him. Lastly, a *seventh class* goes so far in opposing the Infallibility of the Pope that, indirectly, it throws overboard with it the Infallibility of the Church itself. The famous work, of "Janus" on "The Pope and the Council" is considered a representative work of this shade of opinion.

To complete this picture, the writer should, however, have added, that both in the New and in the Old Worlds many millions are only nominally connected with the Church, and care as little about the Infallibility of the Church as that of the Council. It is, in particular, noteworthy, that most of the men who in France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, and other countries, have been noted as the leaders of the Catholic party in politics have shown themselves as earnest opponents of the doctrine of Infallibility. As regards theological scholars and prominent members of the priesthood, it cannot for a moment be doubted, that the men who have achieved the greatest literary reputation are almost unanimous in a very decided rejection of the proposed doctrine. They fully sustain the position of Döllinger, and it is still expected that if the majority of the Council should persist in obtruding upon the Church a doctrine which they regard as subverting the whole foundation of the Church, they will not submit.

In the Council the Infallibilists had, from the beginning, an overwhelming majority. A strong indication of this was given by the composition of the important Commission on Dogmatical Questions, which embraces the name of every Bishop who, by writings, influence, or otherwise, had gained a prominent position in the family of the Infallibilists; in particular, Archbishop Manning, of Westminster; Archbishop Deschamps, of Malines; Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore; Bishop Martin, of Paderborn; Bishop Pie, of Poitiers; the Armenian Patriarch Hassun, of Constantinople. On the other hand, the minority of anti-Infallibilists is not represented in the Commission by a single member. This party of Infallibilists has been greatly strengthened by the open and very emphatic sympathy of the Pope, who has missed no opportunity to censure the opponents and thank and encourage the defenders of the doctrine. The Roman Catholic papers have mentioned many facts of this kind. The author of almost every work in favor of Infallibility has received from the Pope a congratulatory letter, and at the audiences given to Bishops the Pope rarely misses the opportunity to declare it as his opinion that the present state of the Church requires the promulgation of the doctrine.

But overwhelming as was the majority of the Bishops who favored the Infallibility doctrine, and emphatic as was the support given to them by the Pope, many were surprised at the large number of Bishops who openly declared their dissent. Of these, only a few had made known their opinion before the meeting of the Council—foremost among them the veteran champion of Church interests in France, Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans. Most declared themselves for the first time after their arrival in Rome. At the first, most of the Bishops of the Opposition confined themselves to urging the inopportuneness of declaring Papal Infallibility as a doctrine; but as this failed to make the least impression on the majority, arguments against the doctrine itself have been urged with considerable force. The learned historian of the Council, Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, has published a pamphlet on the case of

Pope Honorius, who was declared a heretic by an Œcumenical Council; other pamphlets against the doctrine have been published by Cardinals Rauscher and Schwarzenberg; the Archbishops of St. Louis and Cincinnati have referred to the case of the English Pope Hadrian, who not only gave Ireland to the King of England, but claimed for the Roman Pontiffs the authority to make such donations whenever they pleased. As it takes some time for many of the most important facts connected with this question to become known, we shall, in course of time, learn more of what is now going on in Rome.

An important feature in the history of the Infallibility question is the unanimous opposition of all the governments of the Catholic States. France, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Bavaria, and others, have instructed their ministers in Rome to enter an earnest protest against a doctrine which could compel all members of the Roman Catholic Church to believe in the right of the Pope to depose Kings and release their subjects from the oath of allegiance. It is certain that not a single constitutional government in all Europe will dare to recognize the Infallibility of the Pope, even if the Council should declare it a doctrine of the Church. Thus all those governments will, in the eyes of the Church, become heretical, which may lead to a complete separation between Church and State in all Catholic countries.

THE EASTERN CHURCH—THE BULGARIAN QUESTION.—Among the most important questions which have agitated the Eastern Churches since the beginning of the present century is the reconstruction of a national Bulgarian Church, which is to remain united with the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other parts of the Greek Church in point of doctrine, but to maintain an entire independence in point of administration. This question has obtained a political, as well as an ecclesiastical, importance, as Russia, France, and other European powers have tried to make capital out of it. A decree of the Turkish Government, issued in February, 1870, appears to decide the main point which was at issue. As important results may follow this decision, a brief history of the Bulgarian question will aid in a proper understanding of the situation it now occupies, and of the hopes that are entertained by the Bulgarians with regard to their future. When the Bulgarians, in the ninth century, under King Bogaris, became Christians, the new missionary Church was placed under the supervision of the Greek Patriarch. About fifty years later King Samuel established both the political independence of the Bulgarian nation and the ecclesiastical independence of the Bulgarian Church. But after his death, the Church was again placed under the Greek Patriarch, and did not regain the enjoyment of ecclesiastical independence till the latter part of the twelfth century. After the conquest of the country by the Turks, in 1393, many of the Bulgarians for a while became, outwardly, Mohammedans; but, as religious freedom increased, returned to their earlier faith, and the Bulgarian Church was made an appendage to that of Constantinople. Good feeling prevailed then between the Greeks and the Bulgarians, and the Sultan filled the Bulgarian Sees with Greek prelates, who were acceptable to the people. As the Bulgarian nobility was exterminated, and the people oppressed by wars which followed, there was, until the beginning of the present century, scarcely a single voice raised against the foreign Episcopate. But the national feeling began to assert itself about fifty years ago, and the Greek Patriarch was compelled to authorize several reforms. Abuses continued, however, and the national feeling increased, so that the Patriarch was obliged, in 1848, to approve the erection of a Bulgarian Church, and of a school for the education of priests, in the capital. The demand of the Bulgarians for a restoration of their nationality, in 1856, again aroused the slumbering zeal of the Greeks, and the differences between the two nationalities have continued very active up to the present time. The Porte, in 1862, named a mixed commission, to investigate and settle the difficulties. It proposed two plans of adjustment. According to one of these plans, the Bulgarian Church was to name the Bishops of those districts in which the Bulgarian population is in a majority. The other plan accorded to the Bulgarians the right to have a Metropolitan in every province, and a Bishop in every diocese, where there is a strong Bulgarian population. Both plans were rejected, and the Turkish Government, having been to considerable pains for nothing, left the contending parties to settle the controversy in their own way.

Accordingly the Greek Patriarch, in 1869, proposed a General Council, and solicited the different Churches of the Greek Confession for their opinions and advice on the subject. Greece, Roumania, and Servia declared themselves in favor of the Council. On the other hand, the Holy Synod of Petersburgh, for the Russian Church, declared the claims of the Bulgarians to be excessive, and that, although it considered a Council the only lawful means of settling the points at issue, it feared a schism if the demands of the Bulgarians were complied with, and was further afraid that the fulfillments of the demands of the canons would be refused, and advised the continuance of the *status quo*. The Greek Patriarch, being unwilling to solve the question, the Turkish Government took the matter into its own hands, and in February, 1870, issued a decree which establishes a Bulgarian *Exarch*, to whom are subordinate thirteen Bulgarian Bishops, whose number may be increased whenever it may be found necessary. The Turkish Government has tried to spare the sensibility of the Greeks as much as possible, and has, therefore, not only withheld from the head of the Bulgarian Church the title of Patriarch, but has expressly provided that the Exarch should remain subordinate to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Nevertheless the Patriarch has entered his solemn and earnest protest against the scheme. His note to the Grand Vizier, which is signed by all the members of the Holy Synod of Constantinople, is an important document in the history of the Greek Church, and reads as follows:

To His Highness the Grand Vizier:—Your Highness was pleased to communicate to the Patriarchate, through Messrs Christaki, Efendi, Sagraphras, and Kara-Theodor, the Imperial firman, written upon parchment, which solves the Bulgarian question, after it had been open during ten years. The Patriarchate, always faithfully fulfilling its duties toward the Emperor, whom the Lord God has given to the nations, has at all times remained foreign to any thought that the decrees of the Sublime Sovereign in political questions should not be obeyed. The Oriental Church obeyed with cheerfulness and respect the legitimate Sovereigns. The latter, on their part, have always respected the province which belongs to the ecclesiastical administration. The Sultans, of glorious memory, as well as their present fame-crowned successor, (whose strength may be invincible,) have always drawn a marked boundary-line between civil and ecclesiastical authority; they recognized the rights, privileges, and immunities of the latter, and guaranteed it by Hatti-Humayums. They never permitted any one to commit an encroachment upon the original rights of the Church, which, during five centuries, was under the immediate protection of the Imperial throne. Your Highness: If the said firman had been nothing but the sanction of a Concordat between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarians, we should respect and accept it. Unfortunately, things are different. Since the firman decides ecclesiastical questions, and since the decision is contrary to the canons, and vitally wounds the rights and privileges of the Holy See, the Patriarchate cannot accept the ultimatum of the Imperial Government. Your Highness: Since the Bulgarians obstinately shut their ears to the voice of that reconciliation which we aim at, and since the Imperial Government is not compelled to solve an ecclesiastical question in an irrevocable manner; since, finally, the abnormal position of affairs violates and disturbs ancient rights, the Œcumenical Patriarchate renews the prayer, that the Imperial Government may allow the convocation of an Œcumenical Council, which alone is authorized to solve this question in a manner legally valid and binding for both parties. Moreover, we beseech the Imperial Government that it may take the necessary steps which are calculated to put an end to the disorder which disturbs the quiet within our flock, and which can chiefly be traced to the circulars of the Heads of the Bulgarians, (dated the 15th of the present month.) The Œcumenical Patriarchate enters its protest with the Imperial Government against the creation of these disturbances. Written and done in our Patriarchal residence, Mar. 24, (old style,) 1870. (Signed) GREGORY CONSTANTINE, Patriarch. (Signed) All the members of the Holy Synod.

The note of the Patriarch and his Synod indicates that they are aware that, sooner or later, the national demands of the Bulgarians must be granted; and their chief concern now is, to obtain as large concessions for the supremacy of the Patriarchal See as is possible. A peaceable and a speedy solution of the difference is the more urgent, as during the last ten years the heads of the Roman Catholic Church in Turkey, aided by the diplomatic agents of the French Government, have made the most strenuous efforts to gain a foothold among the Bulgarians, and to establish a United Bulgarian Church. Nor have these efforts

been altogether unsuccessful. Several years ago the Pope appointed the Bulgarian priest, Sokolski, the first Bishop of those Bulgarians who had entered the union with Rome, and who constituted a nucleus of the United Bulgarian Church, which, like the other united Oriental Churches, accepts the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, but is allowed to retain the ancient customs of the ancient national Church, (marriage of the priests, use of the Sclavic language at divine service, etc.) Bishop Sokolski was quite on a sudden carried off from Constantinople, (as was commonly thought by Russian agents,) and has never been heard of since. In 1855, Raphael Popof was consecrated successor of Sokolski; he still lives, and, as the only United Bulgarian Bishop, is present at the Vatican Council. He resides at Adrianople, and under his administration the membership of the United Bulgarian Church has increased (up to 1869) to over 9,000 souls, of whom 3,000 live in Constantinople, 2,000 in Salonichi and Monastir, 1,000 in Adrianople, and 3,000 in the vicinity of Adrianople. The clergy of the Church, in 1869, consisted of ten secular priests.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A new contribution to Biblical Theology is the work of Lic. Schmidt on the Pauline Christology, in its connection with the doctrine of the Apostle on Salvation. (*Die Paulinische Christologie.* Gottingen. 1870.) In the last chapter the author discusses in a special chapter the Christology of the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians, and finds that the Christological views of these Epistles do not sufficiently differ from those contained in the Epistles which, by general consent, are regarded as genuine, to authorize us to regard these Epistles as spurious. According to the author, the real center of the Pauline Christology is the risen Christ, who, as such, has become a perfect spirit-being. (*Geistcesen.*) The human element appears in him in its perfection, and he possesses as highest dignity that of lord of the congregation. From 1 Cor. xv, 27, the author infers that the idea of a divine nature of Christ was still foreign to Paul.

Among recent biographers of great theologians of Germany, the life of Schleiermacher, by Professor Wilhelm Dilthey, in Kiel, is prominent. (*Lebensgeschichte Schleiermachers.* Vol. I. Berlin, 1870.) The work is to be complete in two volumes, each one of which is to embrace one half of the life of Schleiermacher. The first volume, which has now appeared, extends over the thirty-four years from 1768 to 1802, and thus the time from 1802 to 1834 is left for the second volume. The author, already known as the editor of the two last volumes of the collection of letters and documents entitled *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben*, has received from the daughter of Schleiermacher, the Countess Schwerin-Putzar, the whole epistolary remains of her father, "a material," he says, "so ample and well arranged, and, has hardly been on hand for any similar biography." Thus the author has been enabled to give much that is wholly new. His work is classed by many of its reviewers among the best biographical works of recent German literature.

The earnest opposition of the best Roman Catholic scholars of Germany to the proposed doctrine of Papal Infallibility has already called out several classic works which will live for ever in the history of theological literature; such as the famous work, by Janus, on *The Pope and the Council.* The seat of this Catholic opposition to the Infallibilists is the University of Munich, which counts among its professors Döllinger, Dr. Huber, (the supposed author of Janus,) Dr. Frohschammer, an ex-priest, who has formally renounced the communion of the Church of Rome; Dr. Friedrich, the author of the Church History of Germany; Professor Sepp, the author of a large work, in seven volumes, on the Life of Christ, and many others, who are dreaded by the Ultra-montanes as their most dangerous opponents. A number of the scholars of this liberal school have united in publishing a

collection of pamphlets and books, entitled, *Stimmen aus der Kath. Kirche über Kirchenfragen der Gegenwart*, (Voices from the Catholic Church on Ecclesiastical Questions of the Present Day.) for enlightening the Catholic people of Germany on "genuine Christianity and true Catholicism," and for warning it against Ultramontanism. The authors have published their prospectus, in which they urge the necessity of a purification of the Church—that is, of an elimination from the Church of all heterogeneous elements which are foreign to her original consciousness and to her original constitution. In case the Council, which is convoked by Pius IX., should not effect this purification of the Church; if it should, on the contrary, produce a broad division within the Catholic Church; if, what would be the greatest misfortune, the Jesuit school doctrines should prevail over the primitive faith of the Church, even then, says the prospectus, "we shall not abandon our hope, but remain firm in the belief that the Lord will never abandon his Church, and that consequently, a momentary obfuscation of the consciousness of the Church, occasioned as it is by illegal measures, must be followed by a final enlightening." The first work of the collection, which already has appeared, has been prepared by Professor Huber, and is entitled. "Popedom and State." (*Papsttlhum und Staat.*) It was to be immediately followed by a reprint of the letters of Dr. Döllinger, in the *Augsburg Gazette*, on the Infallibility Address, and the new By-laws of the Council; and by a special treatise on the Infallibility question by the Rev. Cl. Schmitz, entitled, *Ist der Papst persönlich unfehlbar?* (Is the Pope personally infallible?) It is expected that a large number of the most prominent scholars of Germany will prepare works for this collection.

The sufferings of the Messiah, in their agreement with the doctrines of the Old Testament and the sayings of the Rabbis in the Talmud, Midraschim, and other old Rabbinical writings, (*Die Leiden des Messias.* Lubeck, 1870.) is the title of a work by Dr. A. Wünsche. It is written from an orthodox point of view. The title indicates the contents.

A new contribution to Biblical Theology is the work of Dr. Kahle on Biblical Eschatology. (*Biblische Eschatologie.* Gotha, 1870.) The first volume which has appeared treats of the Eschatology of the Old Testament.

Dr. Thiersch, who, notwithstanding his connection with the sect of the Irvingites, is respected by the Protestant Churches of Germany as one of the foremost representatives of the orthodox school of theological science, has published a new work on Genesis, explaining it "according to its moral and prophetical sense." (*Die Genesis.* Basel, 1870.)

One of the famous works of German theological literature, the Introduction to the Old Testament, by the late Dr. Wette, has been published in an entirely revised edition, (the 8th.) by Professor Schrader, of Giessen. The new editor is already known by other works as an able exegetical writer, and this new edition of an old standard work is highly commended in the theological papers of Germany. (*Lehrbuch der hist.-krit Einleitung.* Berlin, 1869.)

FRANCE.

A highly important archæological discovery of the present year, the inscription on the triumphal column of the Moabite King, Mesha, is copied and described in a letter, addressed by the discoverer, Charles Clermont Ganneau, dragoman of the French consulate of Jerusalem, to Count de Vogüé, who has long been favorably known by his thorough knowledge of Semitic paleography. The pamphlet (*La Stèle de Mesa, roi de Moab, 896 avant J. C.* Paris, 1870) briefly recounts the circumstances which led to the recovery of the inscription, and after the destruction of the stone by the Bedouins, to a restoration of the text, gives a fac-simile of the thirty-four lines of the inscription, transcribes it in Hebrew characters, and adds a French translation with some remarks on the age of the inscription, and a map of ancient Moab, in which all the towns mentioned in the map are given. It is to be followed by a commentary. There are many gaps in the inscription, especially in its first part, because the proprietors of the stone, the Beni-Hamide, fearing an interference of the Turks in their affairs, shattered the stone to pieces. Ganneau could use an impression of the whole inscription, but it is illegible in many places. It is, however, hoped that in the course of time the Bedouins will be prevailed upon by offers of money

to sell all the fragments of the stone. The inscription is particularly interesting, it being the most ancient document now known composed in an alphabetical writing. The contents of the inscription make it almost certain that the column was erected in the year 896 B.C. The language of the inscription is Hebrew; among the slight variations is the use of the plural ending *n* instead of *m*. It contains but few words not found in the Old Testament. As was to be expected, the inscription has already called forth a number of articles and pamphlets from the Semitic scholars. Ganneau himself publishes a second facsimile, which is much more complete than the one contained in the above pamphlet, in the March number of the *Revue Archeologique*. Ernest Renan has published an interesting article on it in the *Journal des Debats*. In Germany, an essay (*Die Siegessäule Mesa's Königs der Moabiter*. Halle, 1870) has been published on the inscription by the distinguished Orientalist, Constantine Schlottmann, who is already favorably known as a decipherer of Phœnician inscriptions; and in the *Augsburg Gazette*, Dr. Haug has furnished a German translation, with some critical remarks.

Dr. Ad. Schaffer, already favorably known by several works on Church history, has published a work on the Huguenots of the 16th Century. (*Les Huguenots du XVI. Siècle*. Paris, 1870.) The object of the author is not to give a new history of French Protestantism, on which subject we have a number of excellent works, but to describe the inner life of the first followers of the Reformation. He speaks of them as members of the family, as citizens of the State, in peace and war, in joy and suffering, in life and death. He gives numerous extracts from many sources which he has made use of, both Protestant and Roman Catholic.

BELGIUM.

One of the largest works which has been produced by Belgium is that by Professor F. Laurent, of the University of Ghent, entitled, *Etudes sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité*. The seventeenth volume of the work was published last year under the special title, *Le Catholicisme et la religion de l'Avenir*. 1 Serie. (Paris, 1869.) The author believes in some kind of Rationalistic Christianity as the religion of the future; the most important portion of his book is that which shows the irreconcilable gulf existing between Roman Catholicism and the civilization of the present age. The author shows a very thorough acquaintance with the recent history of Roman Catholicism, and in this respect his work is a very valuable store-house of facts.

Art. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Presbyterian Review, April, 1870. (New York.)—1. Nature and Prayer. 2. Is this a Christian Nation? 3. Sin and Suffering in the Universe. 4. Christianity Capable of Self-Defense. 5. Biblical Theology, with Especial Reference to the New Testament. 6. Missionaries, and British Relations with China. 7. The Ground and Nature of Christian Giving. 8. A New Analysis of Fundamental Morals. 9. Recent German Works in Theology and Biblical Literature.

Baptist Quarterly, April, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Greek Text of the Apocalypse. 2. The Malay Archipelago. 3. The Temptation of Jesus. 4. Sex in Nature and Society. 5. The Future Life. 6. Church Polity. 7. Exegetical Studies.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, April, 1870. (New York.)—1. The Element of Time in Interpreting the Ways of God. 2. Pantheism as a Phase in Philosophy and Theory of History. 3. Memoir of Dr. Raffles. 4. The Relation

of Adam's First Sin to the Fall of the Race. 5. The Witness of Paul to Christ. 6. The Christian giving for the Times. 7. Brief Suggestions on Presbyterian Reconstruction and Unification. 8. Recent Publications on the School Question.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, April, 1870. (Andover.)—1. Psychology in the Life, Work, and Teachings of Jesus. 2. A Fourth Year of Study in the Courses of Theological Seminaries. 3. Doctrine of the Trinity. 4. The Year of Christ's Birth. 5. The Silence of Women in the Churches. 6. Prophecy as Related to the "Eastern Question."

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, April, 1870. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Doctrine of Scripture as to the Relation of Baptism and the Remission of Sins. 2. Development. 3. The Bible in the Public Schools. 4. The Philosophy of Faith. 5. The Rise and Establishment of the Papacy. 6. Does the New Testament Determine the Elements of the Public Worship?

NEW ENGLANDER, April, 1870. (New Haven.)—1. The Council of Constance and the Council of the Vatican. 2. A Critical Examination of Professor Huxley's "Physical Basis of Life." 3. Is the Doctrine of the Final Restoration of all Men Scriptural?" 4. Memoirs of Alexander Campbell. 5. Christianity a Universal Religion. 6. The Proprieties of the Pulpit. 7. The New Criticism.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, April, 1870. (Boston.)—1. The Murray Centenary. 2. Everitt's Logic. 3. Schleiermacher's Christology. 4. The First Universalist Church. 5. Our Sunday-Schools. 6. Priest and Prophet. 7. Collective Judgments.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1870. (Boston.)—1. The Physics and Physiology of Spiritualism. 2. Parkman's Discovery of the Great West. 3. Darwinism in Germany. 4. The Legal-Tender Act. 5. Poverty and Public Charity. 6. The Norman Conquest of England. 7. Ténot's Coup d'Etat. 8. The Prospects of the Political Art.

The "North American" has much reduced its oppressive magnitude without reducing its price. It has furnished a number of able articles on the political and commercial moralities of our day. It is Deistic as ever, though much improved by the cessation of the peculiarities of Charles E. Norton.

The first article by the noted Dr. W. A. Hammond accounts correctly enough for a large amount of the phenomena of spiritualism upon natural principles, but incorrectly assumes to cover all classes of cases. As a solution of some of the forms of apparent supernaturalism it has value. In the following queer paragraph Dr. Hammond charges "Methodists" with "desecrating churches:" "It is a striking fact, which would be laughable but for the frequently lamentable results which ensued, that while the Catholic ecstatics inveighed against the heretical sects which were springing up on all sides, and consigned them to torture and the flames, these, the Calvinists, Camisards, Pre-adamites, Jumpers, Anabaptists, Quakers, Methodists, Tremblers, etc., etc., denounced the Pope as Antichrist, desecrated churches, and exhibited a ferocity which in its sanguinary character has rarely been equaled." The "North American" does not elevate itself by tolerating the drivel of such a writer.

In the third article Mr. Charles L. Brace (author of "The Races of the Old World") reports that Darwinism is accepted, "either in part or in whole," by "nearly all the scientific thinkers of England." "In France," he says, "the influence of Cuvier has prevented its just consideration, and only "two celebrated botanists" have avowed a belief of the "changeability of species." In Germany the Atheists have hailed it with rapture, and pushed it to extremes Mr. Darwin would not accept. They exaggerate the resemblance of the simian and human brains, affirming their almost identity. At this point Mr. Brace executes a fine flank movement upon them. If the crania of the ape and man are so nearly alike, then the stupendous spiritual difference between the two races must lie in something besides material structure. This argument Mr. Brace expands with excellent effect. But in our view Mr. Brace is mistaken in maintaining that the Paleyan "argument from design" has lost its validity, even though he also maintains that the Theistic argument becomes equally strong in another form—a form which he illustrates in clear and eloquent style.

English Reviews.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, April, 1870. (London.)—1. Our Lord's First and Last Discourses. 2. Henry Ainsworth. 3. Recent Christian Biography—James Hamilton and William Chalmers Burns. 4. Ezekiel's Place in the Old Testament Church. 5. The Climax of Messianic Prophecy in Isaiah liii. 6. Lecky's History of European Morals from Augustine to Charlemagne. 7. Old Mortality. 8. The Counter-Imputations.

Edinburgh Review, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Viceroyalty of Lord Lawrence. 2. Juana la Loca. 3. M. de Parieu on Taxation. 4. Eastlake and Gibson. 5. Non-restraint in the Treatment of the Insane. 6. Smith's Tour in Portugal. 7. Renan's St. Paul. 8. The Epic of Arthur. 9. Ballot not Secret Voting. 10. Earl Russell's Speeches.

London Quarterly Review, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The English Bible. 2. Lanfrey's Napoleon. 3. The Church in Wales. 4. Sir Charles Eastlake and the English School of Painting. 5. Non-Historic Times. 6. The Education of the People. 7. Mr. Froude's Queen Elizabeth. 8. Annals of an Eventful Life. 9. Government Dealing with Irish Crime.

London Quarterly Review, April, 1870. (London.)—1. Mr. Forster's Education Bill. 2. Raphael and his Times. 3. The Catholic Apostolic Church. 4. Ancient Irish Literature. 5. Life and Remains of Robert Lee. 6. The Laureate and his "Arthuriad." 7. Winer's Greek Testament Grammar.

North British Review, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Church Policy of Constantine. 2. Earl Godwin and Earl Harold. 3. The Early Author of Shakspeare. 4. The Will and Free-will. 5. Jane Austen. 6. Parties and Politics of Modern Russia. 7. The Home Policy of the Session.

Westminster Review, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Unpublished Letters written by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 2. American Socialisms. 3. The Paraguayan War. 4. The English Parliament and the Irish Land. 5. The Imperial Library of Paris. 6. Pauper Girls. 7. Prostitution: How to Deal with it. 8. The Action of Natural Selection on Man.

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) Edited by Dr. Hundeshagen and Dr. Riehm. 1870. Third Number. *Essays:* 1. DOEDES, [Professor in Utrecht, Holland,] Historical and Literary Remarks on the Biography of John Wessel. 2. VAIHINGER, List of the Stations on the March of the Children of Israel through the Desert. 3. KREYHER, Zwinglis and Calvin's Views on Predestination. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. SCHRADER, [Professor in Giessen,] Sargon and Shalmanezer. *Reviews:* 1. DIESTEL, History of the Old Testament in the Christian Church, Reviewed by RIEHM. 2. WEISS, Manual of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, Reviewed by KOHLER.

The first article, by a distinguished theologian of evangelical Protestantism in the Netherlands, contains some interesting contributions to the history of John Wessel, who is commonly regarded as one of the most prominent forerunners of the Reformation among the Germanic nations.

In the article on Sargon and Shalmanezer, Professor Schrader, of Giessen, who is already favorably known among theological scholars as the editor of a new edition of the Introduction of De Wette to the Old Testament, combats the opinion of Dr. Riehm, in a former number of the *Studien*, according to which the names Sargon and Shalmanezer denote the same Assyrian king. Schrader agrees with Ewald, Hilzig, Delitzsch, the Rawlinsons, Oppert, and other writers on this subject, that Shalmanezer was the predecessor of Sargon, and reigned from 727 to 723 B. C.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. Journal for Scientific Theology. Edited by Professor Hilgenfeld. 1870. Third Number.—1. HILGENFELD, Gnosticism, and the New Testament. 2. SCHWEIZER, A Recent Work on Pauline Christology. 3. E. ZELLER, Remarks on Romans viii, 3. 4. HILGENFELD, Reply to Professor Wieseler's Remarks on the Prophet Ezra. 5. EGLI, Critical Remarks on the Text of Exodus.

The first article is one of the most important ones which have for some time appeared in this organ of the Tübingen school. Professor Hilgenfeld claims to have been the first to trace the influence of Gnosticism upon the transformation of the early Christian Church. He finds clear references to Gnostic ideas in several books of the New Testament; and as he holds, on the other hand, that Gnosticism did not yet exist at the time of the Apostles, he must regard those references as arguments against the Apostolic origin of the books in which they are contained. These views were first developed by him twenty-one years ago; he now presents them again, revised and enlarged. The negative views of the Tübingen school have lost ground in Germany during the last twenty years; but Professor Hilgenfeld is generally respected as one of its most learned representatives, and essays like the above will be sure to be studied by theological scholars of all schools,

though they rest so much on guesses and combinations, that the author can expect but very limited assent, even from those who agree with his theological views. The article treats, first, of the Gnostics in the Apostolic age; second, Paulinism and Gnosticism; third, the Deutero-Johannean writings—by this name Hilgenfeld designates the Epistles and the Gospel of John, all of which, according to him, were compiled about A. D. 135; fourth, the latest writings of the New Testament. These, according to Hilgenfeld, are the Epistle of Judas and the Second Epistle of Peter.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. Journal for Historical Theology. Edited by Dr. Kahnis. 1. RATZ, What Luther Gained from Melanchthon. 2. BOEHMER. Francisci Dryandri, Hispani, Epistolæ Quinquaginta. 3. SCHNEIDER, Jacob Neidinger, A Document of the Time of the Religious War in the Palatinate. 4. LINDER, Brief Historical Introduction to the Sermon of H. Erzberger, delivered on Christmas, 1570.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE. (Christian Review,) March 5, 1870.—1. HOLLOND, The Quakers, Essay on the First Years of their Society. 2. LELIEVRE, The Last Council. 3. PRESSENSE, An Address on the Free Conscience. 4. Correspondence from Rome.

April 5.—1. E. DE GUERLE, The Right of Women in the Novels of the Present Age. 2. HOLLOND, The Quakers, (second article.) 3. LICHTENBERGER, The Lutheran Church in Alsace.

May 5.—HOLLOND, The Quakers, (third article.) 2. PEYRE, M. Rognon. 3. DOUMERQUE, The Philosophy of the Works of Molière.

REVUE THEOLOGIQUE. (Theological Review.) Published under the direction of C. Babut, Pastor at Nimes; C. Bois, Professor Theological Faculty of Montauban; T. Bonifas, Professor Theological Faculty of Montauban; R. Hollard, Pastor at Paris; T. Lichtenberger, Professor Theological Faculty of Strasburg; J. Monod, Professor Theological Faculty of Montauban; E. de Pressensé, Pastor at Paris; A. Sabatier, Professor Theological Faculty of Strasburg. First Year. No. 1. March, 1870. 1. CH. BYSE, Authority in Matters of Faith. 2. WARNITZ, Did the Apostle John stay in Ephesus? 3. G. MEYER, The Son of Man and the Son of God. 4. RIVIER, Remarks on Romans v, 12.

In *Revue Theologique* is the continuation of the *Bulletin Theologique*, a quarterly which, during nineteen years, had been the literary supplement to the *Revue Chretienne*, the excellent organ of the Free Evangelical Churches of France. As the names of the editors indicate, the Free Evangelical Church has united with the orthodox school of the two Protestant State Churches, so that the new review may be regarded as the common organ of French Evangelical Protestantism. Pressensé's name alone suffices as a guarantee that the new Review will bring contributions which will deserve and receive the attention of theological students of every country.

Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Christianity and Greek Philosophy; or, The Relation between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece, and the Positive Teachings of Christ and his Apostles. By B. F. Cocker, D.D., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Pp. 531. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The particular field traversed in the work before us may be best set forth in the author's own words:

> In preparing the present volume, the writer has been actuated by a conscientious desire to deepen and vivify our faith in the Christian system of truth, by showing it does not rest *solely* on a special class of facts, but upon all the facts of nature and humanity; that its authority does not repose *alone* on the peculiar and supernatural events which transpired in Palestine, but also on the still broader foundations of the ideas and laws of the reason, and the common wants and instinctive yearnings of the human heart. It is his conviction that the course and constitution of nature, the whole current of history, and the entire development of human thought, in the ages anterior to the advent of the Redeemer, center in, and can only be interpreted by, the purpose of redemption.

Such is the elevated Christian stand-point from whence the author descends to his labor. More particularly he says, in regard to the dominant thought and purpose of the book:

> The central and unifying thought of this volume is, that the necessary ideas and laws of the reason, and the native instincts of the human heart, originally implanted by God, are the primal and germinal forces of history, and that these have been developed under conditions which were first ordained, and have been continually supervised by the providence of God.

No more appropriate nor richer example, in the history of human thought, could have been selected to illustrate or enforce this general statement than that comprehended under the title of "Greek Philosophy." The starting-point, if not the sanction, of the work is derived from Paul's discourse from Mars Hill, Athens. In reading we are constantly reminded of Dr. Whewell's "History of Scientific Ideas," arising out of some similarity of purpose or plan.

In a brief notice such as this it is impossible to do more than give the merest outline of the plan of a work so full of matter. We therefore waive any attempt at a critical analysis and estimate of its contents. This would require, and merits, the space of a long article.

The volume is divided into fifteen chapters. The first is devoted to "Athens and the Men of Athens." The second sets forth, under the head "Philosophy of Religion," the principles the author employs in subsequent parts of the work. This prepares the way, in the two succeeding chapters, for a consideration of the "Relig-

ion of the Athenians." The next three chapters, beginning with Paul's notice of an altar to the "unknown God" at Athens, are entirely devoted to a critical examination of the "Philosophy of the Unconditioned," as held by Sir William Hamilton, Dr. Mansell, and others, in which, against these thinkers, he coincides with Cousin, Martineau, etc., in affirming "God is cognizable by human reason." We suppose this part of the volume was written for the sake of evolving the principles in the light of which the relations of "Greek Philosophy to Christianity" might be determined. We cannot, however, avoid feeling that much of the matter in these three chapters would more appropriately have fallen in the forthcoming volume. Of the remaining eight chapters, six are devoted to the "Philosophers of Athens," beginning with Thales, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, Anaximander, Leucippus, and Democritus, of the "pre-Socratic school," whose influence was predominant at Athens at the time Christianity was introduced into Europe. The discussion of the tenets and characteristics of the various schools of Greek philosophy is conducted with admirable spirit and marked ability. The last two chapters are occupied in a consideration of the "propædeutic"—or preparatory—office of Greek philosophy in relation to Christianity. This is well done, and forms a fitting conclusion to the volume.

On almost every page we find matter for comment. The author shows a well-defined purpose, and never loses sight of it from beginning to end. It shines out every-where. The book is strong, coherent, and highly suggestive. Strong, rather than acute, analytic power, and an excellent faculty for broad, luminous generalization is manifested. The work is characterized by a vigorous, compact, and, considering the nature of the subject, a rather animated style. The author displays a profound knowledge of his difficult subject, and what is especially necessary in a critic and interpreter of philosophical systems, great candor and independence of thought, and a generous, manly sympathy. In Psychology he is a thorough Intuitionalist, standing apparently on the same platform as Cousin and Martineau.

It is with no ordinary pleasure we welcome such an addition to our growing Methodist literature. We can do nothing more than heartily to commend the work to every minister of the Gospel and thoughtful reader as one that will abundantly repay diligent perusal. We will await impatiently the appearance of the second volume, and an adequate estimate of the present, by some competent hand, in the pages of the *Quarterly*. J.

Textual Corrections of the Common English Version in the New Testament. (Covenant.) According to the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts. With the other Ancient Manuscripts, and the Editions of the Vulgate, the Complutensian Polyglot, Stephens, the Elzinis, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alvord. 12mo., pp. 49. New York: John Wiley & Son. 1870.

This little manual proposes to enable the ordinary reader of our English Bible to correct its text according to the highest authorities, furnishing in the most compact form the entire net results of criticism thus far in this department.

First, we have a brief history of the Greek text, from the day of Erasmus down to the present hour, written by Dr. Tregelles, similar in form (but more abridged) to the two articles lately furnished in our *Quarterly*. Next, we have a chapter arguing in favor of the revision of our common version. Then comes the main matter of the work. Thirty-one manuscripts (including "the four great authorities," the Sinaitic, the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and the Ephraim) are enumerated, and nine editors and editions, as sources of comparison. We have, then, a synopsis of all the passages required to be changed by the two highest authorities, the Sinaitic and the Vatican; and the names, in abbreviation, of the editors adopting the alteration. This synopsis it is proposed to extend through the whole New Testament, provided the success of the present issue indicates sufficient public interest in the subject to make it pay expenses. To the increasing number of our scholars interested in a pure text, this brings the entire series of well-authorized emendations of the received text into the most compressed possible form, though many, perhaps, would prefer the readings in the Greek.

An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., of the Oratory. 12mo., pp. 479. New York: Catholic Publication Society. 1870.

Dr. Newman is considered as the ablest of the number of scholarly English divines who have made a transit from the Anglican to the Roman Church. The present volume, though frequently assuming incidentally the truth of Romanism, is liberal in its tone, and written, not with a sectarian, but a generally Christian end.

It is an essay exhibiting the legitimate process of framing conclusions in proportion to evidence. It properly belongs to the department of logic, both theoretical and disciplinary. It abounds with disquisition at once subtle and entertaining, illustrated with numerous striking examples in literature and history. The principles obtained are then applied with no little force to our con-

clusions in regard to religion, and the work becomes an able volume of Christian evidence. It may be recommended to reflect ive men of all classes.

New Cyclopædia of Illustrations, adopted to Christian Teaching: Embracing Mythology, Analogies, Legends, Parables, Emblems, Metaphors, Similes, Allegories, Proverbs; Classic, Historic, and Religious Anecdotes, etc. By Rev. Elon Foster. With an Introduction by Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, D.D. 8vo., pp. 704. New York: W. C. Palmer, Jr., & Co. 1870.

The preacher who makes his sermons of patchwork is little likely to produce any masterpieces. Sermons made from quotation-books are on a level with poems made with a rhyming dictionary. A true sermon, like a true poem, flows forth in rich, spontaneous streams from a full mind and a warm heart. So far forth as this book is intended as a sermon help, we would sooner burn it than buy it. But for those who need and will use such aids, we may say that this is one of the best specimens of its class, being immeasurably superior to the cart-loads of homiletic chips in Schaff's Lange.

Essays on Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion. By Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. From the Seventh London Edition. 12mo., pp. 312. Andover: Warren F. Draper. New York: Felt & Dillingham. 1870.

Whately, though possessing little imagination, has justly maintained a high rank as a patient, subtle, individualistic Christian thinker. The present volume presents five essays on topics connected mostly with the New Testament. To these is added his celebrated historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte. This piece unites *jeu d'esprit* and theological argument in a very unique manner. It is a humorous disproof of the credibility of the history of Napoleon, on the same ground as Hume uses in invalidating the history of Jesus.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. John M'Clintock, D.D., and James Strong, S.T.D. Vol. III. E—F—G. 8vo., pp. 1,048. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The fact that this Cyclopædia is already extensively quoted in the highest quarters as a standard authority decides its position in the literary and religious world. The only drawback upon it is its slow completion—slow in view of the expectation and the convenience of the public, not slow in view of the magnitude of the work.

The Wise Men. Who they were, and How they Came to Jerusalem. By FRANCIS W. UPHAM, LL.D., Professor in Rutgers Female College, New York. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1868.

In this little monograph Professor Upham has been singularly felicitous in concentrating a large amount of new knowledge and fresh criticism upon a very old and difficult question. It is not only an original contribution to biblical literature, but a fascinating book for the inquiring reader. No writer hereafter should discuss the "star" without consulting the Professor.

The Life of our Lord. By Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D.D., LL.D. In six volumes. *The Close of the Ministry.* 12mo., pp. 351. *The Passion Week.* 12mo., pp. 344. *The Last Day of our Lord's Passion.* Pp. 379. *The Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection.* 12mo., pp. 316. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1870.

These four volumes constitute sections of the great Life which has fascinated the thought of the world for centuries, without losing any share of its mystery and glory. Dr. Hanna has given us, in a free, fresh, popular style, the results of ripe scholarship and eminent power.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Des alten Nikolaus Hunnius Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. [*Doctrinal System of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Nicholas Hunnius.*] Bearbeitet von FRIEDRICH BAUER. 3te verbesserte Auflage. 8vo., pp. lxxix 418. Nördlingen: Beck. 1870.

The recovery of the Doctrinal System of Nicholas Hunnius from the obscurity in which it had lain nearly a century and a half was commenced in 1844, when Dean Brandt issued a new edition of it. Singularly enough, it was done in the interest of a mission to America, missionaries for which were under the special care of Pastor Löhe, who had incited the editor to address himself to the enterprise. In 1850 a second edition appeared, and just now we have the third, a very decided improvement upon its predecessors. Nicholas Hunnius, the author, was born in 1585, and came honestly by his decided Lutheran proclivities and dogmatical tastes, for his father was the celebrated Ægidius Hunnius, first a Professor of Theology in Marburg, and later in Wittenberg, at that time the citadel of German Protestantism. His son's principal literary performance, the work now before us, is a clear and frank statement of Lutheranism without any compromise with Calvinism or any other confession. It is what the High Lutherans still believe, and teach their theological candidates. We first have the editor's interesting biographical sketch of the author. The work proper then opens with a Doctrinal Introduction, which, according to our notion, is the most valuable part of the volume.

After stating the fact that the Scriptures abound in figurative language, biblical figures are arranged rhetorically, as follows: Trope, synecdoche, metonyme, metaphor, allegory, comparison, parable, proverb, personification, symbol, typical, symbolico-dogmatical, anti-typical, and sacramental expressions, and vision. The Introduction treats, further, of locality and space in the invisible and future world, Antichrist, and the stages in the order of salvation.

The main divisions are: Doctrine of God; Creation; Sin; Election; Person of Christ; Christ's Humiliation and Glorification; Christ's Work; Order of Salvation; Means of Grace; Church and the Ministry; Eschatology. We find here and there, in the treatment of these topics, points from which the Lutheran Church, as we find it now, has decidedly diverged. The Lutheran systematic theologian of our day would hardly enforce the duty of the Christian to be perfect, as we here find it, (p. 161;) while, on the other hand, his present mode of defining repentance is much less open to objection than that of Hunnius: that repentance consists in sorrow for sin and faith in Christ, but that the confession of sin is not an element of true repentance, (pp. 163–165.) *Ergo*, faith precedes confession. As to the necessity of repentance by every body, Hunnius is very positive and lucid. His statement of what the real Christian does, when partaking of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is likewise clear, and not far out of the way: 1. That he confesses, by public participation, his general belief in the doctrines taught in his Church. 2. That he pledges himself to continue faithful to his Master to the end, and to contend, even at the risk of his life, for his honor. 3. That he obligates himself to live in happy union with other Christians, that all may be one body in Christ. Of course we should expect the doctrine of baptismal regeneration to occupy a prominent place here, and are not disappointed. "Baptism is not a sign, but a means, of regeneration. . . . But any thing which is not water—as milk, beer, wine, mead, and such things—is not appropriate for baptism, for none of these were mentioned at the institution of baptism, or used by the Apostles. Neither can any one know whether God would effect regeneration by any such means, and let it pass as a real baptism." (Pp. 239, 248.) We fear that the Lutheran of our day would hardly consider the following a satisfactory proof of his still unmitigated doctrine of consubstantiation: "Christ has commanded that his body should be eaten with the mouth, and his blood should be drunk with the mouth.

Hence we infer that what we human beings should, in the L... Supper, eat with the mouth and drink with the mouth, is actu... present as a material part of this spiritual meal." (P. 270.) W... then, we ask, call it a *spiritual* meal? Give it its appro... name, and call it a *material* one.

Leitfaden der christlichen Glaubenslehre für Kirche, Schule, und Haus. (El... of Christian Doctrine for the Church, the School, and the Home.) ... J. T. Beck, Professor der Theologie in Tübingen. 2te Auflage. ... xl, 636. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf. 1869.

Dr. Beck is at present the leading theologian of Tübingen U... versity, and is contributing largely toward redeeming that i... tution from the unenviable reputation given it by the l... Ferdinand Christian Baur and his semi-skeptical school. D... Beck is, in most respects, a model professor of theology, ... Tholuck of South Germany. If this were the place, we shou... have something to say on his peculiar ideas—altogether out ... keeping with our century—on the propriety of letting the tr... gain its victories in a quiet way, by its own naturally permeat... and leavening power, without making special efforts for its p... agation. It is too late in the day to relax earnest mission... effort, or faith in its absolute necessity and ultimate success.

The work is based on the three great ideas of Faith, Chari... and Hope. Faith assumes the invisible truth as something hav... an independent and self-communicating existence; still, it ha... a merely outward form, but first comes to our knowledge, and ... accepted by faith. Love, or Charity, applies Faith, and give... an independent relation; it adapts Faith's knowledge of th... truth to obedience to the truth. Hope awaits the coming ful... ment, and assumes the future life in the Spirit. The knowled... of the truth which Faith carries with it, and the obedience to th... truth which love effects, become freedom in the truth by th... things which Hope promises.

The author, in accordance with this plan, divides his doctrin... system into the Doctrine of Faith, the Doctrine of Love, and th... Doctrine of Hope. The present work treats only of the first; th... second has been considered in a separate treatise, *Christli... Sittenlehre*, (published in 1839 and 1842;) the third, in which th... sacraments are to be examined, is to follow. The first part ... the work before us is original matter, and the second contain... only the scriptural citations, in full, referred to in the first. C... tents: Introduction: Fundamental Historical Thoughts. ... Holy Scriptures. 2. The Christian Faith as a positive religi...

3. The obligation at baptism to Christian faith. The Doctrinal System. 1. The divine creation of the world, with its divine order. 2. The non-divine fall, with its divine legislation. 3. The divine redemption of the world, with its order of grace. "Religion," says Dr. Beck, "is faith in and worship of God, and the Christian religion is faith in and the worship of God according to his salvation in the name of Jesus Christ." Accordingly, Christ is the very beginning and end of all true religion, the very essence of all scriptural truth, the object of all that can be called faith. To reject Christ is to reject all revelation, and to renounce all claim to faith. The view of sin, as here laid down, is hardly in harmony with the rest of the author's system. Evil is sin dwelling in man; man *has* in himself and *commits* sin, but the whole man is not sin. He cannot be called sinful, in the sense that he had no more good in himself, and does not do it, but only in the sense that there is a sinful element in all that he does, that *he has and does nothing absolutely good.* The nature of man has not become sin. *Sin only is something which cleaves to him.*

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Laws of Discursive Thought; being a Text-Book of Formal Logic. By JAMES M'COSH, LL.D., President of New Jersey College, Princeton, etc. 12mo., pp. 212. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Logic for High Schools and Colleges. By A. SCHUYLER, M.A., Professor of Mathematics and Logic in Baldwin University. 12mo., pp. 168. Cincinnati: Wilson, Hinkle, & Co.

Professor Schuyler has written a clear, concise text-book, setting forth all the Hamiltonian "improvements," with their corresponding notation and symbols, embracing brief criticisms thereon from Thompson and De Morgan, with Hamilton's vindication in reply. Fig. IV, with all its moods, is here also found once more claiming its ancient niche on historic grounds, whether there are others or not. Every thing is presented clearly, though the manner is highly formal and technical. The book has a very algebraic look, bristling with formulas, and quite thoroughly illustrated by Euler's circles. Rectangles seem better adapted to illustrate extension than circles. The analysis of the science is very thorough, but generally so bare as to demand much effort and enthusiasm from the teacher. The book looks very bony, but we have no doubt that Professor Schuyler makes it live. Let him dress the skeleton in some of his lecture-room homilies, and it will be more winsome.

The work of Dr. M'Cosh is an attempt to ingraft upon the Aristotelian system all that is valuable in the Hamiltonian analysis, at the same time avoiding its errors and defects. Dr. M'Cosh shows that the errors of Mill and the Comteans on the one hand and of Hamilton and the Kantians on the other, have arisen mainly from defective or altogether erroneous ideas on the nature of *notions*, or the elements of the judgment, the "concepts" of Hamilton, the "names" of Mill, and the "terms" of Whately and others. Hence Part I, embracing nearly one half of the work, is devoted to the discussion of the notion. He takes issue at the start with the Kantian postulate that the forms of thought are subjectively determined, and that logic is consequently *à priori* science, showing that this is the error that runs through the whole Hamiltonian system. The author holds, on the contrary, that the science is to be constructed only by a careful inductive investigation of the operations of the mind in thinking. Hence, while the Kantian would start *à priori*, from the unconsciously operating laws of thought, Dr. M'Cosh proceeds *à posteriori*, from an inductive examination of conscious mental operations, and gives us the "fundamental laws of thought" as a supplementary conclusion.

Hamilton's great defect in his discussion of the elements of the judgment is that he has no place for abstracts. The notion is with him, as with all the Kantian logicians, simply a concept. *Redness* cannot be called a concept, with extension and intension, in the sense that the word is applied to *red*, much less as applied to a concrete, as *man*. Dr. M'Cosh accordingly divides notions thus:

NOTIONS—1. Percepts; the singular concrete, as Milton, Bucephalus.
2. Abstracts; as swiftness, beauty.
3. Concepts. (1) Generalized abstract; as red, swift.
(2) Generalized concrete; as poet, horse.

This analysis enables the author to use all that is really valuable in the Hamiltonian theory of the quantified predicate. Hamilton's universal affirmative with a universal predicate (A, f, a,) marks a valuable distinction in the case of substitutive judgments—for example, definitions and mathematical propositions. Following the above analysis of the notion, it will be seen that in all such judgments the terms are abstracts or percepts; for example, 2 (a + b) = 2a + 2b is a judgment where in both subject and predicate are abstracts. "Washington was the father of his country" predicates an abstract of a percept. So in

judgments may be regarded as mathematical equations, wherein neither term can be said to have extension or intension. All the notions that the mind can form fall into one of these three classes, yet they may also be mixed together; especially may the same word be both abstract and concept, as virtue is an abstract primarily, but afterward comes to denote a class, becoming a concept, as when we speak of the virtues, justice, temperance, etc.

Judgments may then be divided into two classes: 1. That wherein the agreement is that of identity or equality; and 2. Where there is a joint agreement of extension and intension Hamilton's U is there accepted with this limitation, while his Y, y, and w are discarded.

The author admits Hamilton's principle, that whatever is contained implicitly in spontaneous thought should be unfolded explicitly in logical forms, but denies with Trendelenberg that this leads to the "thorough-going quantification of the predicate." Much of our thinking is in intension, (comprehension, depth,) and here the quantity of the predicate is, of course, unthought of. To use Trendelenberg's illustration and application, (*Logische Untersuchungen*, ii, 204,) when we say, "Man is responsible," we mean that man has the attribute responsibility, without thinking whether there are other responsible beings or not. To say, "All men are all the responsible," is to say that man has this attribute, and that no other being has it—that is, it is combining two judgments in one, a synthesis rather than an analysis. There is, then, no propriety in using the sign of mathematical equality to express the joint agreement of extension and intension.

Still further, Dr. M'Cosh shows that Hamilton is guilty of an ambiguity in the use of "all." "It is clear, that when we say simply, 'All men are rational,' we mean (when the judgment is explicated in extension) that every one man, every one in the class man, is in the class rational. But, if we have further found that every rational being is in the class man, we are entitled to say, 'All men are all rational.' But what do we mean when we say so? The terms, it appears to us, are no longer general, standing for each and every one of a class; we do not mean, 'Every one man = all rational,' nor 'Every one man = every rational.' The word 'all' does not now mean 'every one,' but the whole collectively. The meaning, in fact, now is, 'The whole class men = the whole class rational.' If so, the terms are not general, applicable to each and every one of an indefinite number, but singular, with a process of abstraction involved." Pp. 101, 112.

Upon these points we think that Dr. M'Cosh's criticism of Hamilton must be accepted as thorough and decisive.

Yet we cannot clearly make out what is our author's idea of the logical judgment. Here he seems to agree wholly with Mill, yet we are unwilling to believe that such is the fact. He says nothing whatever of the valuable Kantian distinction between judgments logical and psychological, but, having defined the notion as the object apprehended by the mind, he defines the judgment as the comparison of two objects of mental apprehension, being careful to say that he does not mean thereby two *mental states*, but *objects apprehended*. But certainly the external objects are not in the mind to be compared. When we assert, 'Alexander was ambitious,' we have not the *man* Alexander in our minds, for he died some years ago; we have a notion 'Alexander,' and a notion 'ambitious,' two mental states, which we compare and assert to agree. But we do more than this: we also assert the existence of objective realities corresponding to the percept 'Alexander' and the abstract 'ambitious.' Here, then, are two judgments, the first logical, and the second psychological, united in one proposition. The first simply asserts agreement between the mental states, the second asserts the existence of objective realities corresponding to the notions. In discursive thought we use nothing but notions or mental states; but in speech, when judgments are put into language, we refer to the objects of possible intuition which the notions represent. We do not understand why the author, by thus making no reference to a distinction that must be familiar to him, seems to coincide entirely with Mill in the analysis of the judgment.

The book is highly readable, not needlessly technical, the recondite discussions being dropped into finely-printed paragraphs so that they can be omitted if desirable. The author uses abundant illustrations, discarding diagrams, occasionally affording us glimpses through long vistas of practical thought, or leading us up to the edge of speculative deeps, which suggest that our guide has a comprehensive view of adjacent regions, to which he might conduct us if he would. N.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art, for 1870. Exhibiting the most important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc. Together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the year 1869; a list of recent Scientific Publications; Obituaries of eminent Scientific Men, etc. Edited by JOHN TROW-

BRIDGE, S. B., Assistant Professor of Physics in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; aided by SAMUEL KNEELAND, M.D., Professor of Zoology and Physiology in the Institute, and W. R. NICHOLS, Graduate of the Institute. 12mo., pp. 354. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1870.

Three great events are specified in the introductory notes by the Editor of the Scientific Annual, as distinguishing the year 1869, in the great department of international intercourse—the Suez Canal, the Pacific Railroad, and the French Cable. Railroad construction is improving, both in new forms of cars, and the introduction of steel as the material for rails. This last improvement is a great securer of safety, and from the durability of material, in the long run the cheapest. When the telegraph, now being rapidly laid from St. Petersburgh to the mouth of the Amoor, is completed, but a narrow marine link is needed to complete the circuit of the globe. Steam and electricity will rapidly revolutionize Asia.

The celebrated chemist, Dumas, in his lecture on Faraday, makes some statements justifying our refusal to accept the assertions of many physicists, that chemistry can account for all the phenomena of life:

> The existing chemistry is all powerful in the circle of mineral nature, even when its processes are carried on in the heart of the tissues of plants or of animals, and at their expense; but she has advanced no further than the chemistry of the ancients in the knowledge of life and in the exact study of living matter; like them, she is ignorant of the mode of generation.
>
> The chemist has never manufactured any thing which, near or distant, was susceptible even of the appearance of life. Every thing he has made in his laboratories belongs to "brute" matter; as soon as he approaches life and organization he is disarmed.

These statements very conclusively check the sanguine words of a note to Professor Barker's lecture, elsewhere noticed: "The chemist is capable of producing from carbonic acid and water a whole host of organic bodies, and we see no reason to question his ultimate ability to reproduce all animal and vegetable principle whatsoever." Perhaps he may yet put up a sign on his laboratory door reading, "Horses and men made to order."

Dr. Carriere, of Jean du Gard, gives the following very simple method of ascertaining actual death:

> Place the hand, with the fingers closely pressed one against the other, close to a lighted lamp or candle; if alive, the tissues will be observed to be of a transparent, rosy hue, and the capillary circulation in full play; if, on the contrary, the hand of a dead person be placed in the same relation to light, none of these phenomena are observed—we see a hand as of marble, without circulation, without life.

Professor Owen substitutes, in place of Darwin's Natural Selection, a new doctrine of Derivation of one species from another by primordial law:

Professor Owen, like Lamark and Darwin, rejects the principle of direct or miraculous creation, and recognizes a "natural law, or secondary cause," as operative in the production of species "in orderly succession and progression." To Cuvier's objection, that, if the existing species are modifications, by slow degrees, of extinct ones, the intermediate forms ought to be found, he replies, that many missing links in the palæontological series have been found since 1830. He gives several examples of these modifications, and dwells specially on *hipparion*, and the other forms between the fossil *palæotherium* and the present genus *equus*.

The difference between Natural Selection and Derivated is thus stated:

Species owe as little to the accidental concurrence of environing circumstances, as Cosmos depends on a fortuitous concourse of atoms. A purposive route of development and change, of correlation and interdependence, manifesting intelligent will, is as determinable in the succession of races, as in the development and organization of the individual. Generations do not vary accidentally, in any and every direction, but in pre-ordained, definite, and correlated courses.

"Derivation" holds that every species changes, in time, by virtue of inherent tendencies thereto. "Natural Selection" holds that no such change can take place without the influence of altered circumstances educing or selecting such change.

"Derivation" sees among the effects of the innate tendency to change, irrespective of altered surrounding circumstances, a manifestation of creative power in the variety and beauty of the results; and, in the ultimate forth-coming of a being susceptible of appreciating such beauty, evidence of the preordaining of such relation of power to the appreciation. "Natural Selection" acknowledges that if ornament or beauty, in itself, should be a purpose in creation, it would be absolutely fatal to it as an hypothesis.

"Natural Selection" sees grandeur in the view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms, or into one. "Derivation" sees therein a narrow invocation of a special miracle, and an unworthy limitation of creative power, the grandeur of which is manifested daily, hourly, in calling into life many forms, by conversion of physical and chemical into vital modes of force, under as many diversified conditions of the requisite elements to be so combined.

"Natural Selection" leaves the subsequent origin and succession of species to the fortuitous concurrence of outward conditions. "Derivation" recognizes a purpose in the defined and preordained course, due to innate capacity or power of change, by which homogeneously created *protozoa* have risen to the higher forms of plants and animals.

Mental Philosophy: Embracing the three Departments of the Intellect, Sensibilities and Will. By THOMAS C. UPHAM, D. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College, Member of the Academy of Metaphysical and Ethical Sciences, Author of "Æsthetic and Moral Letters," "The Interior Life," "Divine Union," etc. In two volumes. Volume I, The Intellect, with an Appendix on Language. Volume II., The Sensibilities and Will. 12mo. pp. 561, 705. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

This is a new edition, revised, but not largely altered, of a work published more than thirty years ago, well known to metaphysical scholars, and extensively used in our higher seminaries and colleges. Though written in the modest style, and perhaps a little too fluid and diffuse, it has hardly been surpassed by any manual of complete psychology. There was no little originality in the work, for which the able author seems hardly to have received due credit, from the fact that its advanced views infused

themselves so gently into the public mind that the public easily forgot whence they came. Professor Upham had to feel and pioneer his way to the acknowledgment of the Will as one of the three co-ordinate faculties of the mind, in opposition to Edwards and Brown, who admitted but two, and identified the will with the desires. This view gave a shock to the scheme of Edwards, even in the system of American necessitarian theology. Dr. Upham is a very cautious as well as lucid thinker. He is firm and fearless where his ground is firm beneath him. He makes no bold dashes into untenable positions. Both in the matter of the intuitions, and of the freedom of the will, he makes the most skillful advances up *to* the unknowable, and stops with a very gentle decision the moment he has reached its boundary. These volumes are still truly standard, and worthy the high place they have occupied in public estimation.

Wonders of Glass-Making in all Ages. By A. Sauzay. Illustrated with sixty-three Engravings on Wood. 12mo., pp. 325. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The Sun. By Amedee Guillemin. From the French. By A. L. Phepson, Ph.D. With fifty-eight Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 297. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of the Human Body. From the French of A. Le Pileur, M.D. Illustrated by forty-five Engravings by Lévullé. 12mo., pp. 256. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The Sublime in Nature. Compiled from the Descriptions of Travelers and Celebrated Writers. By Ferdinand De Lanoye. With large Additions. 12mo., pp. 344. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of Architecture. Translated from the French of M. Lefebre. To which is added a chapter of English Architecture, by R. Donald. 12mo., pp. 288. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of Italian Art. By Louis Viardot. Illustrated with twenty-eight Engravings. 12mo., pp. 339. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The above volumes furnish part of a brilliant series of small duodecimos, in red and gilt, on the most attractive topics of science and history. They are a remarkably successful series of efforts at making valuable knowledge fascinating in the acquirement.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Invitation Heeded. Reasons for a Return to Catholic Unity. By James Kent Stone, S.T.D., late President of Kenyon College, Ohio, and of Hobart College, N. Y. 12mo., pp. 341. New York: Catholic Publication Society. Boston: Patrick Donahoe. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1870.

Dr. Stone's conversion to Romanism came upon him, he tells us, sudden as "a shock." The great Council was about assembling, the Pope's broad invitation to all non-Catholics to come under

his wing was issued, and deep misgivings filled his soul. The long array of arguments for Rome and against Rome had for years been in his full view, and he had strenuously through life persisted in seeing force solely in the latter. A change came over his vision. Suddenly, as by a supernaturalism, the solid fortifications of Protestantism became thin vapor, and the vapory bulwarks of Rome hardened to iron. By a still more wondrous miracle the iron became flexible, shaped itself into a mighty armor, and, harnessing around his person, equipped him at once as a redoubtable hero and champion of the faith. So rapid and thorough was his conversion, that the preface to his work embraces the Latin and English call of the Pope to the heretics, and a fervent prayer containing an invocation to the blessed Virgin as "refuge of penitent sinners." The book impresses us with the sincerity and piety of the author, and, however deep the mental aberration of the change, we do not fear that he has stepped out of the pale of salvation.

The volume is divided into three parts. The first considers Romanism historically, as to its past permanence, its influences on public morals, civilization, and progress, in contrast with the "failure of Protestantism," and its responsibility for persecution. Part second treats the argument for Roman Churchdom from Scripture and antiquity. Part third treats of the Popedom, its scriptural and historic proofs, and its unity, authority, and infallibility. The style is animated, personal, and often eloquent; the logic rather fragmentary, and often requiring its cracks and yawns to be puttied in with unctuous declamation. It is an earnest, fluent, weak book.

The most effective part is where he asserts the benefits of the Church unity in the Middle Ages over the barbarous and semi-civilized tribes of Europe. Inheriting a great amount of undestroyed Pagan civilization, blended with a sublime, expansive spirituality that Paganism never knew, the Romish Church, even in asserting her own autocracy, united, spiritualized, and educated Central and Northern Europe toward, if not into, the Christian civilization which we now inherit. That love of power, carried out by a stupendous amount of force and fraud, constituted a large share of her impulses, is no doubt true. Yet there were virtues also, sanctities, philanthropies, heroisms, and wisdoms, which we scorn to depreciate, and which we claim as belonging to our nature, to our ancestry, and to our common Christianity. The crimes of Rome are specially two: her stupendous fals-

hoods and her stupendous cruelties—both exerted beyond all known measure, in authentic history, in support of her autocracy. When Christendom outgrew her pupilage, when her eyes became too intelligent to be cheated with the myths of the Papacy, the Papacy, of course, refused to recognize her own obsoleteness, and sought to rule with falsehood and blood. In spite of all her purple pomp and her œcumenical display, each advancing year reveals her senility, and the attempt of good, weak men like Dr. Stone to restore her youth are as wise, and will prove as successful, as the aspirations of a modern Hindoo to revive the glories of old Buddhism.

The weakest part of Dr. Stone's book, as it necessarily must be, is the attempt to prove the sovereignty of Peter over the other Apostles, his Roman episcopate, and the Papal successorship to him. The *Scripture argument* to prove Peter's authority over his fellow-Apostles is pure childishness. A pre-eminence, founded, it may be, entirely upon his seniority of age and weight of character, there does appear; but of a dictatorship *over* his fellows, or of a subjection of them under his dictation, not one unequivocal syllable can be found in the New Testament. It is in exaggerating this pre-eminence into *command* that Papal advocates display a sophistry of which it is difficult to believe them not to be conscious. Peter's episcopate at Rome, also, has not one particle of proof that an historian can recognize. Surely Dr. Stone must know what irrelevant buncombe he utters when he prattles about its being a point unquestioned for centuries. Surely he must be the scholar to know that what historical criticism requires is *contemporaneous* testimony, or near enough to contemporaneous, to evince personal knowledge. Over that point Dr. Stone skips, as if committing a conscious dodge. And Peter's episcopate being a myth, the entire chain of Petrine successorship in the Papal line is hooked at the upper end to a nothing, and drops by its own weight. The figment may be bellowed by every bull that roars from Rome, but it is nothing but a stupendous and sonorous lie. It is time the tiresome nuisance were abated.

There are other very important points—as, for instance, the Papal persecutions—on which Dr. Stone seems to exercise the same conscious flimsiness. His fluid declamation sounds like heroics underlaid with misgivings, and his footsteps move with the fearful alacrity of a man nimbly running on thin ice.

We are gratified that the Catholic Publication Society appears

in the field of argument before the American public. We wish they would publish an edition of Janus, and we would readily recommend every reflective Protestant carefully to read Stone and Janus in the same week.

History of the American Civil War. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York, Author of a "A Treatise on Human Physiology," "A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," etc. In three volumes. Volume III, Containing the Events from the Proclamation of the Emancipation of the Slaves to the End of the War. 8vo., pp. 701. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

How far Dr. Draper has succeeded as an accurate narrator of the facts of our history we do not feel prepared to judge. In the mastery of a graceful English style, we have heretofore intimated we do not think him eminent. His work will, we doubt not, furnish very many valuable hints to the future historian, without ever becoming a standard history.

Educational.

An English-Greek Lexicon. By C. D. YONGE. With many New Articles, an Appendix of Proper Names, and Pillon's Greek Synonyms. [To which is prefixed an Essay on the Order of Words in Attic Greek Prose, by CHARLES SHORT, LL.D., Professor of Latin in Columbia College, New York.] Edited by HENRY DRISLER, LL.D., Professor of Greek in Columbia College, Editor of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon," etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 778. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Professor Drisler has laid upon our table a very solid block of Greek erudition. There is something monumental in its look—monumental as embodying the work of many a noble scholar, and as a reminder that we have, at the present day, and in our own country, an elect few competent to complete their labors upon the noblest language ever spoken by man.

The immediate basis of the work is the Lexicon of Yonge, which had brought to a consummation the task of giving the authorities for the various uses of each word. To this Professor Drisler has given many corrections, as well as original additions of his own. We have thus the most complete English-Greek Lexicon ever published.

A very important feature of the book is the learned and elaborate treatise on the order of Greek words by Professor Short, of Columbia College. Such an aid to the art of Greek composition, though of the utmost importance, has not hitherto existed. Professor Short's treatise, covering a hundred closely printed octavo pages, though embodying a large amount of contributions by his

predecessors, is largely original, and, when completed to his own satisfaction, will not only be a grateful aid to the student, but will be viewed as a fine achievement of our American Greek scholarship.

Literature and Fiction.

Evenings with the Sacred Poets. A Series of Quiet Talks about the Singers and their Songs. By the Author of "Festival of Song," "Salad for the Solitary," "Mosaics," etc. 12mo., pp. 495. New York: Anson D. Randolph & Co. 1870.

It is but a few years since it began to be admitted that a hymnist was a poet; just as it was a startling proposition that Bunyan was a great genius. It is very gratifying, therefore, to note how many critics and amateurs have, at the present day, taken a pleasure in leading us over the sacred anthology of the Church. The present volume may rank among the most entertaining of the number. The author ranges over the entire field, showing slight regard for boundary lines, whether chronological, geographical, or denominational.

His plan embraces, after the biblical and Greek, the Latin, early and mediæval; the German of the Reformation-era and the Thirty Years' War; Swedish, French, Spanish, etc.; English, early and later; and finally, English and American, of the present day. The work displays a full mastery of the field, a fine critical power, a catholic and evangelical Christian spirit. Mr. Randolph has done up the externals in very graceful style, presenting a volume very acceptable to the lovers of hymnal literature.

Pamphlets.

The Correlation of Physical and Vital Forces. (University Series, No. 2.) By Professor GEORGE F. BARKER, M.D., Yale College. 12mo., pp. 36. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield. 1870.

This is the second of a series of scientific tracts, to be issued from a New Haven press, embracing the productions of scientific master-minds in Europe and America, in uniform size, suitable for binding volumes.

Professor Barker essays to explain the doctrine of the "Correlation of Forces," and to show that mind is but one of the phenomena of matter. The doctrine which, awkwardly as it seems to us, is named the "Correlation of Forces," is simply this: Motion, heat, light, electricity, and magnetism are all but different

forms of the same substratum, and are reciprocally and quantitatively convertible into each other. The last four are not, as has heretofore been supposed, independent agents, "imponderable substances," but merely properties of matter, or different forms of the same property, *motion*. When either one of these five is made to disappear, it forthwith re-appears in some other one of the five, and in just the proportion of amount. Hence there is forever the same amount of this motion or force in existence. And this is that famous "doctrine," the discovery and demonstration of which are pronounced, for what reason we do not clearly see, the greatest scientific achievement of the present century, rivaling the first discovery of gravitation.

But Professor Barker here assumes to prove, what Youmans and others have maintained before him, that, besides these five, a sixth is to be included, namely, *life—life*, including all the phenomena of *thought*, which have heretofore been attributed to an independent agent, or "imponderable substance," called *mind*, *soul*, or *spirit*. He endeavors to show, from various experiments, that heat is convertible into thought, and thought into heat; so that thought is but the motion of the brain. This brings us back to the old Democratic doctrine that there is nothing in the universe but matter and motion.

In his closing paragraph the Professor asks, "Is there no immortal portion separable from this brain tissue?" and he replies, "Here science vails her face, and bows before the Almighty," and makes his appeal to "revelation" and "faith." He avoids showing how his demonstrations do not exclude "faith." Nor does he take pains to show us how the negation of all finite spirit does not destroy "the Almighty." Perhaps the universe is a great cerebrum in eternal motion, thinking with infinite wisdom, and acting with infinite power; and so—God!

The first number of the "series" is Huxley's "Protoplasm;" the third, Sterling's reply to Huxley.

On this general topic we jot the following suggestions:

1. One of the most fundamental of all the maxims of both philosophy and theology is Plato's: Mind is prior to matter. Mind is superior and all comprehending; matter is good for nothing, and might just as well be so much vacant space but for its subserviency to mind. One monad of mind, if solely existing, would be worth a whole universe of matter alone. Hence, when the Materialist makes mind an appendage to matter, an accident, or property, he commits a *hysteron-proteron*, a cart before the horse, a *præ-poster*ous proposition.

2. Mind, as before all things, is the producer of all things. It is first cause, the source of causation. All power, all force, resides primarily in mind; and all exertion of power, all eventuality, and all motion, come from mind. Mind is the source of motion.

3. When the theologian, ages ago, declared that *God is omnipotent*, he asserted, previous to any philosophy, the indestructibility of *force*. He declared that the amount of force existing is always the same, namely, *infinite*. And there is no objection to saying that the amount of force measured out by the Almighty to our mundane creation is always the same, unless varied by miracle. The infinite mind, with infinite power, controls the universe.

4. When the Materialist affirms that thought is a *property of matter*, we will assent if he will change a term and say, *thought is a property or motion of substance*. For God is a personal *substance;* and so is *spirit* or *mind*. And so we agree that thought is the motion or action of conscious mind or spirit.

5. Has any physiologist, any embryologist, any morphologist, explained the minute molecular causations why the fœtus in the human womb does not assume the shape of a lizard or tadpole? Do any of the laws of chemistry or natural philosophy constitute, singly or collectively, a *plastic power* by which we can see how the specific human form is molded? We know that soul (of the parent) is a previous condition; and on the principle that the fœtus, patterned to a plan, is truly "mind molded," we may assume that *the soul* of the fœtus really and truly shapes the body. Mind is prior to matter, and body is soul-shaped and soul-pervaded.

6. If mind or spirit is prior to matter and source of causation, mind is capable of impact and impulse upon matter. This we see demonstrated in the action of the will-power upon body and upon external objects. And mind is consciously susceptible to impact from matter, as is demonstrated from the phenomenon of sensation. Isaac Taylor calls corporeity "an amalgam of mind and matter;" and by that amalgam man is the contact point, the mediation, between the world of matter and the world of spirit. By this means thought appreciates a blow upon the body. So that conscious soul stands in correlation with both antecedent and subsequent material conditions.

7. But the great point with our physicists is, that thought is now demonstrated to be one of the six convertibles of force or motion. *Thought is a mode of motion.* How, then, can there be an immortal soul? We reply: Thought is the motion of con-

scious spirit; of spirit capable of receiving impulse from, and communicating impulse to, matter in correlation with it. But the *soul is, perhaps, immortal only in the conditions of immortality*, and eternally capable of spiritual motion or thought only *in the conditions of thought*. We have no proof that, separate from body, spirit may not be eternally placed by God in the conditions of life and thought-motion. We have abundant proof that it is so placed.

Miscellaneous.

THE SOUTHERN GENERAL CONFERENCE.

"That notorious Commission," as it was courteously styled by the "St. Louis Advocate," presented itself before the Southern General Conference in the persons of Bishop Janes and Dr. Harris. They were received with unsurpassable hyperboles of cordiality and courtesy in both word and action. They were waited upon by a most honorable committee selected by the Conference, were invited to unfold their message audibly before that venerable body, were listened to with the profoundest respect and attention, were honored personally with a complimentary resolution, were greeted in private with the heartiest and most winning Southern frankness, and invited to fill pulpits belonging to the Church South. There is nothing more fascinating than the blandishments of our chivalrous Southern brethren. We have known some of the noblest specimens of human nature belonging to that kin. And when underlaid with a stamina of genuine moral character, no spiritual magnetism is more attracting. Yet, alas! in this case, as often, underneath the rosy wreath was the double edged sword. Cut and dried for the crisis of the presence and speech of our two victims, Dr. Keener, the most bitter of the Southern editors, (leaving the rabid and ribald "Tom-Bond" out of the count,) drew from his pocket a series of resolutions denying that the delegates had any official business there, declaring that separate organizations must be firmly maintained, and re-affirming the response of the Southern Bishops at St. Louis. The entire triad of resolutions, after review by a Committee, were, with silent, prompt, automatic precision, all passed in lump by a unanimous rising vote.

The most significant point of the three is the indorsement of the Episcopal manifesto. And the most significant point in that Episcopal manifesto was the declaration, that the absolute condition to

the South's hearing any proposals of fraternization is our recognition of the so-called "Plan of Separation." And the significant point in said "Plan" is, that both Churches must retreat to the boundary line that divided the free and slave States; that is, the Methodist Episcopal Church must abandon her three hundred thousand members in the Southern States, with all her churches and other institutions, confess the sin of her intrusion, limit herself north of Mason and Dixon's line, and then the Church South will graciously listen to and consider her petition for an exchange of ecclesiastical courtesies. It was thus that the Southern Bishops, with the profoundest professions of Christian love and burning desire for Christian union, did, with the most graceful and decisive explicitness, lay down conditions for fraternization which they very well knew included self-stultification, self-crimination, and self-degradation on the part of our General Conference. Confess yourselves fools and knaves, and then we will hear your proposals; and then we will trample on your proposals, because, by your own profession, you are fools and knaves. And let no one for a moment imagine that both the Bishops and the General Conference South do not understand and deliberately intend the full force of this "Plan." In 1848 Dr. Pierce said, in his parting words to our General Conference, the condition of our receiving any offer from you is the "Plan of Separation." The Bishops at St. Louis quote his language, and in 1869 say, "His words are our words." Their unanimous General Conference in 1870, by the most plainly *concerted* action, unanimously adopt the "words" of these same Bishops. So that through twenty-two eventful years this pseudo "Plan of Separation" has been the sole condition for reconciliation. The conclusion, therefore, is as irresistible as fate, that the representative bodies of the Church South mean to make ecclesiastical recognition an impossibility, by prescribing terms which no man's self-respect would permit him to consider. But perhaps another quadrennium may work a revolution.

Meantime a new South is coming into existence, upon which we must concentrate our attention and our forces. Already our Southern Methodist Episcopal Church numbers nearly half as many as the Church South. Immigration from Europe and the North will constitute a new population, with no warlike recollections, no regret for dead slavery, no sympathy for an obsolete Church, demanding the ministrations from a Methodism of a free and loyal history. Ready to co-operate with every Christian body, yet accepting no restraining limitations, let us enter with

renewed energy the inviting field, and another generation will see a free, unsectional, untrammeled Methodism covering our entire country.

Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. Henry Cowles, D.D. 12mo., pp. 363. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

One of a series of volumes on the Old Testament, which have heretofore received favorable notice in our pages, by the learned Oberlin professor. We may safely recommend it to scholars and Christian readers.

The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. Translated from the original Hebrew, with a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. By E. Henderson, D.D. Author of Commentaries on the Books of the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah and Lamentations, Isaiah, etc. 8vo., pp. 228. Andover: Warren F. Draper. New York: Felt & Dillingham. 1870.

Dr. Henderson's Commentaries have sustained a high rank in England, and will no doubt be welcomely-received by the American clergy.

Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. By William G. T. Shedd, D.D., Baldwin Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Eighth edition. 8vo., pp. 439. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

A History of Christian Doctrine. By William G. T. Shedd, Professor of Biblical Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York. In two volumes 8vo. pp. 408, 508. Vol. I. Third edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

New editions of valuable works which have been favorably reviewed in our *Quarterly*.

The Elements of the Hebrew Language. By Rev. A. D. Jones, A.M. 8vo., pp. 163. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1870.

Mr. Jones has been successful in furnishing for the beginner in Hebrew a horn-book marked by singular clearness and simplicity.

The Word; or, Universal Redemption and Salvation: "Pre-ordained before all Worlds." A more Evangelical, Philanthropic, and Christian Interpretation of the Almighty God's Sacred Promises of Infinite Mercy, Forgiveness, and Grace. Reverently submitted to Christendom. By George Marin de la Voye, a Septuagenarian Optimist. 8vo., pp. 320. London: Whittaker & Co., Trubner & Co.

Memoir of the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., Thirty-six Years Missionary in India. By Rev. J. B. Waterbury, D.D. 12mo., pp. 307. New York: Harper & Bros. 1870.

American Political Economy; including Strictures on the Management of the Currency and the Finances since 1861, with a Chart showing the Fluctuations in the Price of Gold. By Francis Bowen, Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity in Harvard College. 12mo., pp. 495. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The History of Rome. By THEODORE MOMMSEN. Translated, with the Author's Sanction and Additions, by the Rev. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow, late Classical Examiner in the University of St. Andrew's. With a Preface by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ. New edition, in four volumes. Vol. II. 12mo., pp. 568. Vol. III. 12mo., pp. 571. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

A Manual of Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; including the Decisions of the College of Bishops, and Rules of Order applicable to Ecclesiastical Courts and Conferences. By HOLLAND N. M'TYEIRE, D.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. 24mo., pp. 256. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1870.

Self-Help. With Illustrations of Character, Conduct, and Perseverance. By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of "The Life of George Stephenson, and his Son, Robert Stephenson," "The Huguenots," etc. 12mo., pp. 447. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

In Spain and A Visit to Portugal. By HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSSEN, Author of the "Improvisatore," etc. Author's Edition. 12mo., pp. 289. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1870.

Our Father in Heaven. The Lord's Prayer Explained and Illustrated. A Book for the Young. By Rev. J. H. WILSON, M.A., Barclay Church, Edinburgh, Scotland. 12mo., pp. 325. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

The Juno Stories. Mary Osborne. By JACOB ABBOTT, Author of the "Rollo Books." Small 12mo., pp. 301. Red and gilt. New York: Dodd & Mead.

Juno Stories. Juno and Georgie. By JACOB ABBOTT. Green & gilt. Small 12mo., pp. 312. New York: Dodd & Mead.

Life and Alone. Green and gilt. Small 12mo., pp. 407. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Elm Island Stories. The Young Ship-Builders. By Rev. ELIJAH KELLOGG Green and gilt. Small 12mo., pp. 304. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Popular Library of History for Young People. "Stories of Old England," "The Hero of Brittany," "History of the Crusades," "Count Ulrich of Lindburg." 16mo. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

Out in the World; or, A Selfish Life. By HELEN JOSEPHINE WOLFE. 12mo., pp. 288. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1870.

The Bazar Book of Decorum. The Care of the Person, Manners, Etiquette, and Ceremonials. 12mo., pp. 278. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The First Book of Botany. Designed to Cultivate the Observing Powers of Children. By ELIZA A. YOUMANS. 12mo., pp. 183. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic War. With Explanatory Notes, a Copious Index, and a Map of Gaul. By ALBERT HARKNESS, LL.D., Professor in Brown University. 12mo., pp. 377. New York: D. Appleton & Co. London: 16 Little Britain. 1870.

The Life of Bismarck. Private and Political; with Descriptive Notices of his Ancestry. By JOHN GEORGE LOUIS HESEKIEL. Author of "Faust and Don Juan," etc. Translated and Edited, with an Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and Appendices, by KENNETH R. H. MACKENZIE, T.S.A., F.A.S.L. With upward of One Hundred Illustrations by Diez, Grimm, Peisch, and others. 8vo., pp. 491. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Poor Mundi; or, Modern Science testifying to the Heavenly Father. Being, in substance, Lectures delivered to Senior Classes in Amherst College. By Rev. E. P. BUGG, D.D., Author of "Ecce Cœlum." In two volumes. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 294. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. 1870.

Classical Study. Its Value illustrated by Extracts from the Writings of Eminent Scholars. Edited, with an Introduction, by SAMUEL H. TAYLOR, LL.D., Principal of Phillips Academy. 12mo., pp. 381. Andover: Warren F. Draper. New York: Felt & Dillingham. 1870.

God is Love; or, Glimpses of the Infinite Father's Affection for his People. From the Ninth London Edition. 12mo., pp. 366. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Fiction.

Lothair. By the Right Hon. B. DISRAELI. 12mo., pp. 371. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

A Brave Lady. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," "A Life for a Life," "Olive," "The Ogilvies," "A Noble Life," etc. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 176. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Baffled; or, Michael Brand's Wrong. By JULIA GODDARD, Author of "Joyce Dormer's Story," "The Search for the Gral," etc. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 159. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Miss Van Kortland. A Novel. By the Author of "My Daughter Elinor." 12mo., pp. 180. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Debenham's Vow. By AMELIA B. EDWARDS, Author of "Barbara's History," "Half a Million of Money," "Miss Carew," etc. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 178. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Home Influence. A Tale for Mothers and Daughters. By GRACE AGUILAR. New Edition. 12mo., pp. 386. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

Beneath the Wheels. A Romance. By the Author of "Olive Varcoe," "Patience Caerlydon," "Simple as a Dove," etc. 12mo., pp. 173. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Tom Brown's School Days. By an Old Boy. New Edition, with Illustrations by Arthur Hughes and Sidney Prior Hall. 12mo., pp. 135. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Marion and Jessie; or, Children's Influence. By the Author of "Agnes Morton," "Honor Bright," etc. 12mo., pp. 210. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1870.

Notices postponed to next number:

Wakefield's Theology. Pittsburgh: J. L. Read & Son.

Mountford on Miracles. Boston: Fields & Osgood.

March's Anglo-Saxon Grammar. New York: Harper & Brothers.

DR. NAST.—We are informed by a note from Rev. Dr. Nast that he is not to be held as maintaining the doctrine of the Trinity, to which we objected in our late notice of the Bibliotheca Sacra. We expect to insert in a future number an article from his pen on the subject.

Methodist Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, 1870.

Art. I.—DE GROOT ON GNOSTIC TESTIMONIES TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

[ARTICLE FIRST.]

Basilides am Ausgang des Apostolischen Zeitalters, als erster Zeuge für Alter und Autorität Neutestamentlicher Schriften, insbesondere des Evangeliums Johannes, in Verbindung mit anderen Zeugen bis zur Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Von P. Hofstéder De Groot, Dr. der Theol. und Prof. in der Univ. zu Gröningen Deutsche vermehrte Ausgabe. Leipsig. 1868.

When Dr. De Groot translated into Dutch the little work of Tischendorf, "When were our Gospels Written?" he was led to a critical examination of the "patristic literature so far as it affords us insight into the first century and the first half of the second." The results of this investigation he published in Dutch, and afterward enlarged his work and republished it in German, under the title indicated at the head of this article: "Basilides at the Close of the Apostolic Age, as the First Witness for the Antiquity and Authority of the New Testament Writings, especially of the Gospel of John, in Connection with other Testimonies till the Middle of the Second Century." Dr. De Groot dedicates his work to Tischendorf as furnishing *new* proof of the genuineness of the Gospels, and in his notes he replies to the work of Dr. Scholten * which was directed against Tischendorf.

One of the most important works for establishing the genu-

* For an account of Dr. Scholten's work see Methodist Quarterly Review, July, 1869, pp. 463, 464.

ineness and authority of some of the principal books of the New Testament is the recently discovered work, "Refutation of all Heresies," of Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus Romanus, in the first part of the third century. This work was brought by a Greek, Mynoides Mynos, from Mount Athos to Paris in 1842, and published at Oxford in 1851. Its value is recognized by the greatest scholars. Gieseler describes it as "indisputably the most important discovery of recent times for the history of philosophy and of the ancient Church." Even the extreme Rationalists of the Tübingen school generally admit its credibility; and Baur, their head, in the last edition of his Church History, makes great use of it, and expressly defends its truthfulness against the Roman Catholic scholars, who would gladly reject as untrue what Hippolytus relates to the disadvantage of some of the bishops at Rome.

Basilides.

Respecting this great heretic, De Groot remarks:

We wish, first of all, to make our readers more intimately acquainted with this man a contemporary of the last surviving apostle, and his testimony to the antiquity and authority of several writings of the New Testament, especially of the Gospels of Luke and John, that we may afterward compare what we shall find in him with other testimonies of the most ancient times.

But the question arises, When did Basilides live? The answer to this question was hitherto quite indefinite, the year 125 being generally assumed as his most flourishing period. But some weeks ago my attention was excited by a passage of Hippolytus, which contains a more exact indication on this point, and which has hitherto been observed by no one; much less has it been brought into connection with other reports. The passage in Hippolytus runs as follows: "Basilides and Isidorus, the genuine son and disciple of Basilides, says that Matthias (who took the apostleship of Judas) imparted to them orally secret doctrines which he had privately heard from the Saviour."

The editors have changed the singular "says" into the plural "say." In Greek these two forms are distinguished by a single letter only, (φησίν, φασίν,) and the Greek manuscript of Hippolytus has many errors. If "say" must be read, then Hippolytus relates that Basilides and Isidorus both so speak, from which it would follow, if we adhere to the very words, that Matthias had instructed father and son, and that the son must have been old enough to be able himself to hear the Apostle. But if we do not take the passage so literally, and especially if we read the singular, "says," then Hippolytus relates that Basilides says, in which Isidorus agrees with him, that Matthias had made these communications to Basi-

lides, and that Basilides afterward communicated them to Isidorus, and thus, in a certain sense, Matthias had made communications to both. At all events Basilides, at least, was a contemporary of Matthias.

This determination of the time of his life is in harmony with the account given by Clement of Alexandria, that Basilides called himself the disciple of a certain Glaukias, who was said to be a disciple of Peter. Basilides, as we may infer from this, was too young to be able to call himself a disciple of Peter, who was known to have died under Nero in the year 67. He was old enough, however, to come in contact, as Hippolytus relates, with the successor of Judas, Matthias, of whose death there was no definite report in circulation in the Church, and who may, accordingly, have lived till eighty or ninety years after the birth of Christ.

Basilides could accordingly maintain—without uttering any absurdity—that Matthias had communicated to him *orally* secret doctrines of Jesus Christ. This word *orally* evidently lies in the meaning of the Greek (εἰρηκέναι) and in the very nature of the case; for if Matthias had made his communications in writing, Basilides would have quoted his writing by name. Basilides must, therefore, have been too young to have had intercourse with Peter himself, but old enough to enjoy the instructions of Glaukias, a disciple of Peter, and those of one of the last surviving apostles, Matthias perhaps. For, in order to recommend himself to the Christian community, he represented himself as a disciple of Matthias, and could not have fallen into the absurdity of appealing to an apostle to whose probable period of life his own age did not extend.

The time of Basilides can be derived from many other accounts respecting him, all of which place his most flourishing period under Trajan (97–117) and under Hadrian (117–138;) whileit is further known with certainty that already under Hadrian a refutation of the principal work of Basilides was made and published by Agrippa Castor. From this it follows that Basilides did not publish his work later than under Hadrian, and, indeed, if not before Hadrian, at least so early under this Emperor that it had already circulated and obtained influence, and another writer had time to write a refutation of it. Besides, the learned writer Jerome states that Basilides died during the persecution of the Christians by Bar-Cochba, (132–135.) At all events he was no longer young, as he did not die later than in the year 135, for he had lived long enough not only to have a son, Isidorus, but to have him as a genuine disciple. If he was in the year 135, the time of his death, sixty years old, he must have been born in the year 75; if seventy years old, then he must have been born in the year 65. In the first case *he had lived about twenty-five years*, in the second case *about thirty-five years, with the Apostle John*, and might have lived some years with other apostles, also with Matthias. We are, accordingly, clearly justified in maintaining that Basilides was a contemporary of the last surviving apostle, (John,) as Jerome has also

clearly asserted, so that his public appearance falls in the time of Trajan, (97–117.) *

Dr. De Groot having thus accurately fixed the age of Basilides, proceeds to consider

The Use of the Writings of the New Testament by Basilides.

It being established, then, that Basilides lived from about 98 until 135, and that he was a younger contemporary of the Apostle John and of other last surviving apostles, we proceed further to consider *what testimonies this man gives to writings of the apostolic age*. Basilides, in the few fragments that are preserved of him in Hippolytus, gives us in rapid succession quotations out of the New as well as out of the Old Testament. He appeals to Gen. i, 3, as to an expression of Moses, "Let there be light, and there was light;" and then he says further, "This is what is written in the Gospels, [John i. 9,] 'That was the true light which enlighteneth all men who come into this world.'" After quoting from Psa. cxxxiii, he introduces the following from Rom. viii, 19, 22: "As it is written, 'The creature itself likewise groans and is in travail, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.'" Somewhat further on we find out of Rom. v, 13, 14, "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, as it is written." Following these are various passages of the Old Testament. After citing Proverbs i, 7, he remarks, "This is the wisdom that speaks in a mystery, of which the Scripture says, 'Not with words which human wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth,'" [1 Cor. ii, 13.] Somewhat further on we find the two following passages out of Ephes. iii, 5, 3, and 2 Cor. xii, 4, with an allusion to 1 Cor. xv, 8: "As of an untimely birth has the mystery been made manifest, which was not made known to former centuries, as it is written, 'Through revelation was the mystery made known to me,' and 'I heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter.'" Shortly after follows, "This is that which is said, [Luke i, 35:] 'The Holy Ghost will come upon thee, and the power of the Highest will overshadow thee.'" And finally we read, somewhat further on, "The Saviour says, [John ii, 4,] 'My hour is not yet come.'"

All this clearly proves, in the first place, that Basilides was acquainted with more than one, and at least with two of our Gospels, those of John and Luke, as well as with four Epistles of Paul, the Epistle to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians,

* Baur, in his History of the Church, Th. I, sec. 126, remarks: "The most reliable testimonies respecting the origin of Gnosticism agree that the founders of the Gnostic heresies appeared in the age of Trajan and Hadrian." He names Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion.

and the one to the Ephesians. If, now, the proofs of his acquaintance with these six writings are clear, we are not to conclude that still more books of the New Testament were not known to him, because we do not find them quoted in the few fragments.

But, in the second place, he regarded these writings as Holy Scriptures, clothed with undoubted authority as well as those of the Old Testament. He continually makes use of the standing formulæ, "As it is written," "As the Scripture says," "This is what is said," entirely in the same way in his quotations out of the New as out of the Old Testament. In the midst of quotations from Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms and the Proverbs, appear passages out of the New Testament. He evidently places the books of the New Testament in the same, class with those of the Old.

Further, these biblical books have with Basilides exclusively a sacred authority; for he quotes, so far as we know, no apocryphal writing, no single work of a Greek philosopher. He wishes to recommend his system by means of books which have authority with his readers, and these books are exclusively those of the Bible, both those of the New and of the Old Testament.

Finally, it would have been an absurdity if Basilides had wished to recommend his system by means of these books, if they had not already possessed authority in his time. Basilides is, therefore, not a witness of his own opinion merely, because his object was to procure for his system universal admission among the Christians, and with this aim he recommended it by appealing to the writings of the New Testament. So that it appears altogether certain that already in his time, in the universal judgment of the Church, these writings possessed sacred authority.

These are some of the results which we have obtained from Basilides's own words, preserved only in Hippolytus. But do these results become uncertain and doubtful, or incredible, indeed, when compared with what we know from other quarters respecting Basilides? We shall see.

According to Eusebius and Jerome, Agrippa Castor, in the time of Hadrian, wrote a refutation of the system of Basilides, which was probably directed against the twenty-four books of the latter "On the Gospel." This account of Eusebius and

Jerome is confirmed by other testimonies; for Clement of Alexandria quotes several expressions out of the twenty-three of these books, which Clement calls "Expositions." In these quoted passages we find thoughts and expressions which are evidently borrowed from 1 Peter iv, 14–16. For the existence of these books of Basilides still another witness speaks—some lines in an old writer quoted out of his thirteenth book. Basilides, therefore, most certainly not only made use of several books of our New Testament, but he even published "Expositions of the Gospels" in a comprehensive work which was divided into twenty-four books or chapters.

From this we may infer that Basilides endeavored to recommend his system by artificial explanations of the Old Testament and apostolical writings, especially of the Gospels, (at least those of Luke and John, perhaps also those of Matthew and Mark,) comprehended under the expression, THE GOSPEL; for the fragments of him preserved in Hippolytus are full of such explanations, and we find similar explanations also in the passages from his writings and those of his son, Isidorus, and other followers, quoted by Clement of Alexandria Origen, and Epiphanius. Further, it must not be overlooked that in these passages out of Basilides and his followers, besides passages from the Old Testament, there are also quoted Matt. vii, 6; xix, 11, 12; Rom. vii, 7; ix, 10; 1 Cor. vii, 9; 1 Pet. iv, 14–16; so that, in addition to the six writings of the New Testament which we knew, from Hippolytus, were quoted by Basilides, two new books are to be added, Matthew and 1 Peter, the first of which is used by Isidorus, and the second by Basilides himself. Now when Origen and Jerome speak of a Gospel of Basilides altogether unknown to us, Gieseler has already conjectured that by this expression not a special book, but his system was meant. He says: "Basilides wrote twenty-four Books of Expositions which were also probably called his Gospel." The Gospel of Basilides, accordingly, would indicate the same thing as the Gospel of Paul, that is, the preaching or doctrine of Basilides or Paul, but no book of theirs. At all events, the Expositions of Basilides were of *the* Gospel, not of a Gospel of Basilides.

This conjecture of Gieseler is strongly confirmed by the particulars which Hippolytus gives us respecting Basilides. According to his statements Basilides distinguishes *the Gospel*, or the glad tidings of the most excellent revelation, from the different books in which the glad tidings are contained.

After Dr. De Groot gives proof of this from Hippolytus he proceeds:

The case is clear, Basilides wrote twenty-four Books of "Expositions of the Gospel," that is, of the science of heavenly things.

This science he obtained, according to his assertion, from the instructions of Matthias and Glaukias, and brought it into harmony with the Gospels of John and Luke, probably also with that of Matthew and the Apostolical Epistles, by arbitrarily explaining these writings to accomplish the harmony. The statement of the other Church Fathers respecting the use that Basilides made of the New Testament agrees entirely with what we find in Hippolytus. Basilides, then, was acquainted with at least two Gospels, those of John and Luke, and his genuine son and disciple, Isidorus, with still another, that of Matthew; and Basilides made use of at least four Epistles of Paul and one of Peter.

But we find still more respecting Basilides. Jerome relates that Marcion and Basilides removed from the New Testament several passages, and even whole Epistles, and that they denied as Paul's especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, that to Titus, and the two to Timothy, while they had no ground for this conduct except the fact that their errors were refuted in these passages and books. But the Epistles which he denied to be Paul's were then just as well known to Basilides as were the other Epistles which he quotes, and they were acknowledged by his contemporaries to belong to this apostle, otherwise Jerome could not speak of his denying the Pauline origin of these Epistles.

We are accordingly justified from the foregoing in drawing the conclusion that Basilides, the contemporary of the last surviving apostle, was already acquainted with a good part of our New Testament, that he regarded many of its books equally with those of the Old Testament as sacred writings, and that he endeavored to recommend his system by making in a comprehensive exegetical work, expositions of the Gospel.

But we must further conclude, as I have already indicated, that the public opinion of the Christians in the time of Basilides had already placed the books of the New Testament as high as he himself did, because, to recommend his system, he appealed against them to these books, explained in his own way, as sacred writings.*

Use of the Writings of the New Testament among the other oldest Gnostics.

From Basilides we now turn to the oldest sect of the Gnostics themselves, to the Naasseans or Ophites, that is, Serpent-Brethren. We shall see that these, so far as it concerns their knowledge of

* Professor Scholten, in his work "The Oldest Witnesses," etc., says, "Basilides, according to the testimony of the Fathers, had made a Gospel of his own, to which he gave his own name, and he asserted that he was indebted for his wisdom not to the writings of the New Testament, but to a secret tradition reaching back to the apostles, and especially to Peter, communicated to him by means of a certain Glaukias." "I must call special attention to the fact," says De Groot, "that what is here said of Basilides on the ground of patristic testimony is not said by the Fathers at all, but is a pure inference of Mr. Scholten. Scholten *reads* in the

the New Testament and their appreciation of it, perfectly agree with Basilides. These Serpent-Brethren, some of whom found true wisdom in the serpent, (Gen. iii,) from which the name of the sect arose, have become better known to us than formerly from the numerous fragments of their writings preserved in Hippolytus.

They were evidently the oldest sect of the Gnostics. Hippolytus says, when he begins to speak of the Gnostics: "The first priests and forerunners of this doctrine are the Ophites; afterward they gave themselves the name of Gnosties, (enlightened ones,) which they maintain that to them alone the depths of wisdom are known. From these have many heretical sects broken off, who have taught the same thing in a different way." Irenæus, who was likewise acquainted with them, says in the conclusion of his account of them that "the school of Valentinus sprang out of them." They are, therefore, older than Valentinus, respecting whose age we shall speak presently. That they are older than Valentinus and are his teachers appears from their system, which is more simple than his, but follows the same direction. This system is with them a germ in a state of development, but with Valentinus it has attained a further growth. They themselves related that they were indebted for their deep mysterious doctrine to a certain Marianne, (otherwise entirely unknown,) to whom James, the brother of Jesus, had intrusted it. But James died as a martyr before the destruction of Jerusalem, in the year 69, as was generally known, consequently they do not date their origin earlier than the year 70; at latest, still in the first or beginning of the second century. They must, therefore, have arisen about the same time that Basilides did: Their latest writing known to us is a hymn sung at their secret solemnities, in which their principal ideas are summed up, and which is referred by a great linguist (Schneidewin) to the time of Antoninus Pius, (138–161,) accordingly to the middle of the second century.*

In order to determine with still greater certainty the time in which we find the Ophites, I wish to make some statements respecting the age of Valentinus, who made his appearance after

Fathers that Basilides appeals to Glaukias; from this he *infers* that Basilides did not, therefore, appeal to the writings of the New Testament as a source, and thus gives us his *inference* as a patristic *testimony*. The words of Scholten 'to the writings of the New Testament, but' must be stricken out, and with these words fall away all the conclusions he drew from his first inference, which he calls a patristic testimony."

* Scholten says of the Ophites and Perates: "These sects do not yet appear in the writing, *Adversus omnes hæreses*, which forms an appendix to the *Præscriptiones Hæreticorum* of Tertullian, from which it is to be inferred that they can not belong, as Tischendorf supposes, to the first period of the Gnostics. Also [from the arguments" *e silentio!* But here there is no such silence in Tertullian. Scholten's assertion is—*untrue*. In that appendix, cap. 47, is the following: *Accesserunt hic hæretici etiam illi, qui Ophitæ nuncupantur*. The Perates were a subordinate division of these.

them. He himself ascribes to himself a high antiquity when he asserts that he was indebted for his secret doctrine to a Theodades, (otherwise unknown,) who was a disciple of Paul. Further, we know, what does not contradict this, that after he had in the time of Hadrian (117–138) spread his doctrine in Egypt, he came from Alexandria to Rome as a party-leader about the year 140, and died, an old man, in Cyprus about the year 160. As this Valentinus is younger than the first Ophites, their sect must reach back into the first century.* They are generally recognized as the oldest sect of the Gnostics. Some, indeed, maintain that Paul (1 Tim. i, 4) refers to them, which is not impossible, because Phrygia, their native place, was not far from the Church in Ephesus, of which Timothy was overseer.

How, then, did this sect—that appeared before Valentinus with writings that contained the germ of the Valentinian system—stand toward the New Testament? What did they know of it, and what value did they attach to it? They proceed in the same way as Basilides. They quote in rapid succession on one page many passages out of the New Testament, place them on a par with those from the Old Testament, make use of them, explained in their way, as proofs of their system, and use the biblical writings as having a sacred authority. They occasionally quote, with the express mention that it is the Scripture which they are using, the following books: Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Psalms, Matthew, Luke, the Gospel of John, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Galatians. Among all the quotations there is found but one apocryphal writing, the *Gospel of Thomas*, quoted, while Hippolytus once compares their views with a passage in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, certainly a striking proof that the Apocrypha, however old some of them may be, not only are later than the Canonical Scriptures, but also that they originally were but little esteemed and but little used. Some passages are quoted in the very words, while others are given more freely; various expressions are cited from the Gospels as the words of the Saviour. The authors, according to the custom of the time, are nowhere named, except in a quotation from 2 Cor, xii, 2–4, Paul, the Apostle, is named where the case required it.

After this we have a sect kindred with the Ophites—before the discovery of Hippolytus's works hardly known to us by name—the Perates, who honored the serpent. They, too, used the books of the Old and New Testaments as authorities to support their doctrines. From the New Testament they quote the Gospel of John, Matthew, Corinthians, and Colossians. These sects quote the Scriptures with the formulæ, "It is said," "The Scripture says," "It is written."

* C. F. Baur says that Valentinus lived a short time after the beginning of the second century in Alexandria, and later in Rome.

The use of the New Testament by Valentinus and his Party.

Gieseler and many others regard it as remarkable "that Valentinus not only received the New Testament, but that in his system he made a continual allegorical use of it, so that he formed his system of Æons, for the most part, after John i. See Irenæus, Lib. I, cap. viii, 5." Valentinus maintained that he had received his doctrine from Theodades, a disciple of Paul. This determination of time is confirmed by the ancients, who relate that he came to Rome about 140, and died, an old man, about the year 160.

The system of Valentinus we already knew quite fully from Irenæus, but now still better from Hippolytus. From both, and from other Church Fathers, we know that Valentinus and his followers possessed the writings of the New Testament as well as those of the Old, and used them as invested with sacred authority. Irenæus says this of them in the clearest language. He cites a number of passages from the Bible which Valentinus and his party used to give a Christian coloring to their speculations. He quotes incidents and expressions out of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, (i, 1–14.) Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians. The question now arises, What can we with certainty ascribe to Valentinus himself? What did Valentinus, who appeared as the leader of a sect in the time of Hadrian, (117–138,) believe or say of the books of the New Testament?

What Irenæus says of the Gnostics, accordingly of the Valentinians, that they, with the exception of the Marcionites, received the New Testament the same Tertullian says of Valentinus. In contrast with Marcion, who made havoc of the New Testament, he places Valentinus as one who made use of the New Testament without any alteration. Also Irenæus says, where he speaks of the credibility of Luke, that Marcion as well as Valentinus cites much that is to be found only in Luke and in the Acts of the Apostles. Further, the doctrine of the Æons, the foundation of the whole Valentinian system, which must have proceeded from him, and which is conceded by every body to be his doctrine, was brought by him entirely into connection with John i, 1–14, and, as it appears, was derived from a work called by him and his sect "The Book of John, the disciple of the Lord." *

The result that we have obtained, that Valentinus himself was acquainted with a large portion of the New Testament as we have possessed it since the time of Tertullian and Irenæus, and that he made use of it along with the old Testament, is confirmed by Hip-

* Irenæus, Lib. I, cap. viii, 5. Strauss, who endeavors to break the force of this passage says, "Life of Jesus," 1864, p. 68, that this paragraph is taken from Ptolomæus, therefore it cannot relate to Valentinus himself. But he can have no other ground for this than that in the old translation of Irenæus, at the end, are found these words: *Et Ptolæmæus quidem ita.* But this is a gloss of the translator. It is not found in the Greek text of Irenæus!

polytus, who gives us extracts, partly from Valentinus himself, and partly from the writings of his school in general.

Hippolytus cites, as taken from Valentinus himself, the following books of the New Testament: The Gospel of John, Luke, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians.

But when Hippolytus has quoted a passage of Luke on the conception of Jesus (Luke iv, 35) out of Valentinus, he remarks, "A difference of opinion has sprung up on this point among the disciples of Valentinus, so that they have divided into an Oriental and an Italian school." And then Hippolytus further speaks of these disciples, partly of all of them in general, and partly of individuals, with the special addition of their name. It is clear, then, that Valentinus, who appeared in the time of Hadrian as the head of a sect, himself was acquainted with and used as Holy Scripture the New Testament, and, along with it, the fourth Gospel as a writing of "John, the disciple of the Lord."

From Valentinus De Groot passes on to the most distinguished of the earliest disciples of Valentinus—Ptolemæus and Heracleon.

Of Ptolemæus we still possess one epistle, in which a multitude of passages are quoted from the Old Testament and from Matthew, one out of John, and several from the Epistles of Paul. In the quotation of John i, 3, he remarks, "The apostle therefore says." We possess far more from Heracleon, who was not only a scholar, but also an acquaintance, and therefore a contemporary, probably somewhat younger, of Valentinus. Besides other works, he wrote an exposition of the Gospel of John, of which Origen has preserved for us numerous fragments. From these fragments it appears that Heracleon explained this Gospel allegorically and arbitrarily, but that he in no way doubted its credibility, or its Johannean origin. Heracleon not only raises no objection to the apostolical origin of the fourth Gospel, but even remarks on John i, 16, (in Origen:) "The disciple (John) does not say this, but the Baptist (John.") With this falls to the ground the remark of Scholten, that Heracleon has nowhere said that he regarded John as the author of the Gospel. That Heracleon should write an exposition of the Gospel of John to recommend his own views is a sufficient proof that as a general thing in his time, about the middle of the second century, this Gospel had absolute authority in the whole Church, among the Catholics as well as among the Gnostics. As far as Valentinians are concerned, this is not only expressly affirmed by Irenæus, but their very words are quoted: "John, the disciple of the Lord, writes when he speaks of the origin of all things: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.'" Then the first fourteen verses of the Gospel are cited almost

entire, and explained in their own way. But the Valentinians ... Valentinus, Ptolemæus, and Heracleon. Therefore Hera... ascribed the fourth Gospel to John, the disciple of the L... Further, it is evident from the words of Heracleon that he w... also acquainted with Matthew and Luke, perhaps also Mark, a... with at least several of the Epistles of Paul.* It must also be borne in mind that we find in Irenæus a great multitud... passages from the New Testament which Valentinus and his d... ciples quote; so it is evident, not from Hippolytus only, that th... made an extensive use of the New Testament.

I can addnce still another strong proof, hitherto scarcely noticed, that the oldest Gnostics made use of the New Testament exactly in the manner represented by Hippolytus in his numerous citations from their writings.

In the works of Clement of Alexandria is found an extract from the writings of a Valentinian of the name of Theodotus, and of some of similar sentiments, which is exuberant—entirely after the manner of the Gnostics in Hippolytus—in quotations and allegorical explanations of passages from the Bible, and especially from the New Testament, while not a single quotation of an apocryphal Gospel appears in it. The only question is, When did this Theodotus and his kindred spirits live? This question seems hitherto to have been overlooked. It is, however, expressly given in the title itself, which runs as follows: "Extracts from the writings of Theodotus, and of the so-called Oriental doctrine of the time of Valentinus." We shall see whether this date deserves credit.

Thus the very words are here professed to be given us of the Valentinians who lived in the time of their master. But Valentinus had already finished his system before the year 138; in the year 140 he appeared in Rome, and died in 160. In these extracts, then, the Valentinians speak from the middle of the second century. We must assume this if internal evidence does not contradict the title in this respect, and in my judgment this is not the case; for I find nothing in them which points to a later, but much which points to the given date; and as these extracts, as far as the use of the Bible is concerned, entirely agree with those of Hippolytus, they thereby mutually confirm their credibility.

The extracts from Theodotus and the Oriental doctrine fill, in an edition of the works of Clement in small octavo, only thirty pages, and, nevertheless, they contain eleven literal or substantial quotations from the Old, and not less than seventy

* De Groot shows that Scholten is entirely wrong in supposing that Irenæus does not mention Heracleon.

eight from the New Testament.* Besides, these passages are cited exactly from the same writings, and explained in a similar way as Valentinus and his school do in Irenæus and Hippolytus. Can one, indeed, wish a stronger confirmation of the credibility of the quotations of Hippolytus than these citations out of Theodotus and other old Valentinians?

Results.

Basilides, a younger contemporary of the last surviving Apostle, does not then stand alone in his use of many books of the New Testament. With him agree several of his younger and older contemporaries, the earliest sects, and the founders of sects among the Gnostics. In the same way as Basilides, the Ophites, (with the exception of the Perates and Sethians, who are probably later,) Valentinus, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, Theodotus, and their followers, make use of the New and the Old Testament as holy writings, or writings possessing authority. And although we may not be able to determine exactly from the sparsely scattered fragments of their works whether they possessed and recognized all the books of the New Testament, as they were known to Irenæus and his successors, yet we know this with certainty of the most important writings, namely, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 Peter; while Basilides also, if we can trust the testimony of Jerome, denied as Paul's the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and to the Hebrews, so that they must have been known to him and recognized by others as Paul's.

It must be observed, further, that these Gnostics not only placed the books of the Old and the New Testament as holy writings in a rank by themselves, but that they wished that their doctrines should have authority with the Christians from these writings alone. And although they occasionally quote a passage out of Homer and out of other heathen writers, the impression is very different from the quotation of Scripture with

* Dr. De Groot gives a half page of small type notes containing the quoted passages. They are introduced with the formulæ, "The Saviour says," "The word of Jesus," "The apostle says," etc.

the formulæ, "It is written," "It is said," "The Scripture says," "The Saviour says," "The apostle writes." *

It is singular that only a few passages from apocryphal writings are quoted by them. Only a few words from the Gospel of Thomas and that of the Egyptians are found in the midst of numerous citations from the canonical Scriptures. And although they have erred in placing these Gospels (apocryphal) too high, yet this is only an exception among more than one hundred and sixty quotations from our New Testament; and when later writers speak of a *Gospel of Basilides*, and a *Gospel of the Truth* of the Valentinians, there is no sufficient ground for supposing here Basilides and Valentinus's own works, but that their system was thereby meant; at any rate, works in which their followers summed up the system of their predecessors.

Finally, the Gnostics would never have thought of appealing to the Scriptures of the New Testament if these writings had not possessed, in the universal conviction of Christians, a sacred authority. For the Gnostics sought to gain for their peculiar *medley* of heathenism and Christianity admission into the Christian community. To this medley they gave the name of a deeper science, GNOSIS, which, in order to give it a Christian coloring, they pretended to have received, as a secret doctrine of the Lord, out of the mouth of the Apostle Matthias, or of a disciple of the apostles, of Glaukias, for example, or of Marianne or Theodades. In order to give to this pretense the appearance of truth, they took writings universally acknowledged and possessing authority, and explained them in such a way that the same doctrine might seem to be found in them that they pretended to have received from an apostle, or the disciple of an apostle. If, in their time, the Old Testament had been the only writings which the Christians regarded as sacred, they would have had an easy task by means of allegorical explanations, more or less after the manner of Philo, in making the Old Testament say whatever pleased them. But they took upon themselves the very difficult task of lending to their dreams an authority from the Gospels and Apostolical Epistles, as well as from the Law

* Irenæus says, Lib. III, cap. ii, 7: "So great is the certainty respecting these (four) Gospels that even the heretics themselves bear witness to them, and every one of them, setting out from these Gospels, endeavors to establish his doctrine."

and the Prophets. The only possible reason why they undertook this hopeless task was that the Christians would otherwise have repelled them immediately with the exclamation, "We know better than that from the preaching and the writings of the apostles and evangelists." The endless labor, of which the Gnostics never grew weary, of finding a foundation for their system in the Gospels and in the Epistles of Paul and Peter, would have been folly if these writings could have been thrown aside, and it had been necessary to appeal to the writings of the Old Testament only. The use which the Gnostics made of the New Testament requires that, in their time, by far the greatest part at least of this New Testament, along with the Old, possessed authority and was used as Holy Scripture in the Church.

From this frequent and thorough recognition and use of the apostolic writings by these Gnostics, who flourished from 97 or earlier to 150, it clearly follows that about the beginning of the second century the most important books of the New Testament were not only already in existence, but were in general circulation and were every-where recognized in the Church, and, although no mention was yet made of a Canon, regarded as sacred writings possessing authority, and were bound up with those of the Old Testament.*

Why did the Gnostics Earlier than the Catholics Appeal to the Authority of the Writings of the New Testament?

Under this head De Groot remarks: "Until a few years ago the opinion prevailed that Theophilus of Antioch, about the year 170, was the first Church Father that placed the writings of the New Testament in the same rank with those of the Old." But since the discovery of the very ancient manuscript of the Bible in the Convent of Mount Sinai by Tischendorf—at the close of which is the Epistle of Barnabas in the original Greek text, containing the following passage of Matthew, pref-

* Here also Baur comes to my aid. He acknowledges the credibility and accuracy of Hippolytus, (Church History, I, pp. 181–183, etc.,) and has no doubt of the accuracy of his quotations from Basilides, Valentinus, etc. Consequently, if Baur were consistent, he ought to acknowledge that the Gospels, especially that of John, and many Epistles, were already known to Basilides and to others of the oldest Gnostics.

aced with the remark, *as it is written*, (ὡς γέγραπται), "Many are called, few are chosen"—it is evident that one Church Father, at least, at the beginning of the second century,* the time when this Epistle of Barnabas was written, must have quoted one book of the New Testament as a part of Holy Scripture.

In addition to this epistle of Barnabas we have the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in which is given what each of the twelve sons of Jacob, upon his death-bed, said to his children and grandchildren; among other things, the future of their people and the blessings of Christianity. The author is evidently a well-wishing, thoughtful, earnest man, who sought in this way to gain over the Jews to Christianity. He wrote toward the end of the first or the beginning of the second century; at all events, in the first half of the second century before the third destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian in the year 135.† In this pretended prophecy allusion is made to the Apostle Paul, and it is added: "*In the holy books* will both his deeds and his speeches be described." *The* holy books in which the deeds and speeches of Paul were to be recorded can scarcely be any other than the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul. We thus see that these writings are called by the author *holy* books; and it may also be added that not only these, but nearly all the books of our New Testament, to which he frequently alludes, and from which he takes very many words and thoughts, are regarded as sacred.

In the oldest Church Fathers we find more frequently quotations from the Gospels than the Epistles, and Eusebius expressly relates that in the time of Trajan (97–117) men went from Palestine to travel among the heathen as evangelists, "while they wished to preach Christ and to distribute the Scripture of

* It is not necessary to refer this book to the beginning of the second century, as De Groot does. Clement of Alexandria, President of its catechetical school, (191–202,) attributes the Epistle to Barnabas, which he could not have done had it not come down from the first century. It seems to us most likely to have been written between A. D. 70 and 80. The author refers to the destruction of Jerusalem in such a way as to make the impression that this event had just occurred. See sec. 16. Even Hilgenfeld, the leader of the extreme Rationalistic school of Tübingen, refers the epistle to the first century. We have also the following: "Since you have seen so great signs and wonders among the people of the Jews," sec. 4.

† For this date see in Dorner, *Entwickelung Geschichte von der Lehre der Person Christi.*

the divine Gospels." Under this expression is to be understood our four canonical Gospels. This wide circulation of our Gospels is further confirmed by testimonies and quotations from them in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers.*.

The epistle to Diognetus, by its freshness and originality, and by its contrasting Christianity on one hand with Judaism and heathenism on the other, without containing a trace of Gnosticism, makes the impression that it was written at a very early period, before Gnosticism had spread, so that we may, in all probability, refer it to the time of Trajan, in the beginning of the second century. Although this epistle is only a few pages long, it contains allusions from which it follows that its author was acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew and John, the Epistle to the Romans, the second to the Corinthians, that to the Philippians, the first to Timothy, the first Epistle of Peter and the first of John. This epistle to Diognetus would prove still more if we could regard as genuine the last two chapters; for in these two chapters the author calls himself a disciple of the Apostles, and he places the Gospels and the epistles precisely in the same rank with the Law and the Prophets, that is, the New Testament with the Old.. He writes, (in the Christian community) "The fear of the law is sung, the grace of the prophets is made known, the faith of the Gospels is established, and the tradition of the apostles is kept." He quotes 1 Cor. viii, 1, "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth," with the addition, "as saith the apostle." There are, however, weighty reasons against the genuineness of these last two chapters.

Justin Martyr may also be cited as a witness to the early authority of the Gospels. He says in his larger Apology, written probably about 147,† that in the assemblies of the Chris-

* De Groot does not enter into the proof of the use of our Gospels by the Apostolic Fathers. The ground he assigns for this is, "Because, at present, the genuineness, at least the integrity, of all these writings is disputed." There is no reason whatever for questioning the genuineness or the substantial integrity of the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written A. D. 95–98. This epistle was usually read in the Christian assemblies in Corinth in the second century. See Eusebius, IV, 23, 6. Nor is the epistle of Polycarp to be doubted either in respect to its genuineness or integrity. It is referred to by Irenæus, Eusebius, IV, 14, 3.

† We prefer with Neander, Gieseler, Tischendorf, and others, on what we think very good grounds, to refer this work to the year 138 or 139.

tians the memoirs of the apostles or the writing of the prophets are read. He also remarks a few lines before that these memoirs are called GOSPELS; and finally, that they were written by the apostles and their companions. The Gospels of the apostles and their companions and the writings of the prophets were thus, already in his time, placed so completely on a par that they made use of the one as well as of the other in divine service. That he by apostles means Matthew and John, and by their companions, Mark and Luke, may be justly inferred from many quotations and allusions in his work, although he may have known a fifth Gospel besides, and ascribed it to an apostle.* It is also evident from his works that he probably was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles and with many epistles, and that he was certainly acquainted with the Apocalypse.

As an example of the method the heretics pursued in using the Gospels in support of their system De Groot gives the following: Basilides placed at the head of his system an absolute Nonentity, in order that he might not be able to speak of God as of an existing, but as of a non-existing Being. Originally, therefore, there was nothing, no matter, no substance, nothing that had substance, nothing simple, nothing compound, no man, no angel, no God; accordingly nothing of all that which we can perceive or imagine. Nevertheless the non-existing God created a non-existing world out of nonentity. After Basilides has made this assertion he gives a Christian varnish to his representation. He continues: "This is what Moses says: Let there be light, and there was light. Out of what was light made? Out of nothing. For it is not written out of what; it came into existence simply from the voice of the speaker; but the speaker had no existence at all, and that which was created was likewise non-existent. Out of nonentity sprang the seed of the world, namely, the word which was spoken: Let there be light. And this is that which is said in the Gospels: That was the true light that lighteth all men who come into the world."

How, asks De Groot, were the allegorical, fanciful and

* We find in the writings of Justin no proof of his use of a fifth Gospel, to which De Groot here alludes, nor do we think that Tischendorf has made out this point in his work, "When were our Gospels written?"

absurd expositions of the Gnostics to be refuted ? Not by appealing to the written word, for to this word the heretics themselves appealed, but by appealing to the authority of the *Living* Word, as it had been preached by the apostles and was still preached by their disciples. In proof of the great stress that the Christians of the second century laid upon this *living* traditional word, he quotes Papias and Irenæus. He likewise refers to Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian of Carthage, whose lives extended into the third century, as attaching great importance to the traditions of the Church.

De Groot likewise calls attention to the fact that under the prosperous reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius, there still lived eye-witnesses of the time of Christ and his Apostles, and that communication with different parts of the Christian world was easy, so that there was no difficulty in obtaining the history of Christ from oral testimony, which rendered unnecessary the appeal to the written word; while the Gnostics, whose doctrines were entirely at variance with the living traditions of the Church, had no resource for establishing their system but in elaborate, forced and fanciful expositions of the Gospels.

Do the Citations from the Writings of the New Testament really proceed from the oldest Gnostics?

The principal objection which the Tübingen school raises against the assertion that Basilides quotes the Gospel of John * as one of the Gospels, (for this assertion has already been very often made by scholars,) and against the quotations from the New Testament in the oldest Gnostics, is this, that we do not know with certainty whether all that Hippolytus attributes to the old Gnostics really proceeds from these, and not from some who lived later. Especially is this the case respecting Basilides. What Hippolytus quotes from him is not from Basilides himself, they say, since it may possibly proceed from some one who indeed belonged to the school of Basilides, but may have lived later.† For, they say, Hippolytus makes no clear dis-

* Hippolytus, III, 22. This is what is written in the Gospels, That was the true light which lightens all men who come into this world.

† This objection of the Tübingen school, scarcely deserves a refutation. We know from the best testimony that Basilides *wrote* twenty-four books in explanation of his system. De Groot has clearly shown that. The followers of Basilides must have

tinction between the head of a sect and the members of a sect, as we see, for example, when he speaks of Valentinus and his school. This remark, so far as it concerns Valentinus and his school, is not without ground. Neither Hippolytus, nor Tertullian, nor Irenæus always clearly distinguish the founder from the disciples in this school. Where they speak of them they generally say, "Valentinus and his followers," or "the school of Valentinus," or the "Valentinians." This was altogether proper; for Valentinus did not there stand alone, but had a number of independent men for disciples and friends who improved his system and made changes in it. Tertullian clearly expresses this when he says, "Valentinus opened the way, Ptolemæus paved it, and Heracleon furnished it with by-roads." Thus, although we know in many respects what must be attributed to Valentinus, namely, the opening of the way or the foundation of the system, yet it is not possible every-where to distinguish the master from his disciples. But with Basilides the matter is entirely different. Here we have not a master, and disciples independently making changes in his system, but only a master whose system was adopted and implicitly followed, but not improved. Valentinus stood at the head and in the midst of numerous independent followers, while Basilides stood alone at the head of individuals who followed his views without making any changes in them. The only one of his followers that we are acquainted with is Isidorus, and he is "his genuine son and disciple." When, therefore, Irenæus speaks of the system of Basilides he does not say, as of Valentinus, "Basilides and his followers," or "the school of Basilides," or "the Basilidians," but with the greatest brevity, "Basilides." Hippolytus does the same. When he speaks of the system of this man he gives us sometimes to understand that many followed him, and he very often speaks of them (the Basilidians) in the plural, but every time he expressly repeats that he speaks of the system of Basilides. This is so

preserved this work of their founder to the time of Hippolytus at least, a hundred years. That Hippolytus should leave the work of the founder of the system and refute some obscure follower of his, and call it refuting Basilides, is altogether absurd. He had no distinguished follower with whom he could be confounded. Who, in attempting a refutation of Calvin, would think of quoting and refuting some obscure follower of his, with the pretense that he was quoting and refuting Calvin himself? The quoting of John by Basilides is in justification of the very foundation of his system.

much the more remarkable as Hippolytus, when he speaks of both of them at the same time, himself says that he is treating of the system of THE SCHOOL of VALENTINUS and of the system of BASILIDES. In his copious exposition he closes Book VI with the remark that he is now going to pass from the SCHOOL OF VALENTINUS to BASILIDES. And in the summary at the end of his work he speaks, X, 13, of the SCHOOL OF VALENTINUS, and afterward, § 14, of BASILIDES. Thus we have almost continually "Valentinus and his party," and on the other hand only "Basilides."

This great difference F. C. Baner himself recognizes when he says it cannot certainly be shown what belongs to Valentinus and what to his followers, because Hippolytus does not speak of the system of Valentinus, but of the VALENTINIAN SYSTEM; but when he comes to Basilides, he (Hippolytus) explains THE SYSTEM OF BASILIDES and not the Basilidian system. Accordingly the effort, from the uncertainty that exists in reference to Valentinus, to infer a similar uncertainty respecting Basilides is nothing but a sheer subterfuge. The words of Basilides quoted in Hippolytus are really the words of Basilides, and not those merely in which he quotes two passages of John, but all the others in which he quotes something from the Old and the New Testament.

Yet, upon the whole, the doubt may be raised, Must what Hippolytus gives us as taken from the old Gnostics really belong to them and not to later Gnostics? The Tübingen school asserts the latter, because their system respecting the later origin of the writings of the New Testament irrevocably falls if Hippolytus faithfully quotes.

We have several reasons against this doubt.

The most of the quotations of the Gnostics out of the New as well as out of the Old Testament are found in Hippolytus, who made it his duty to give the passages which they used, and the way in which they did it. But he is not the only one who gives us such quotations. Irenæus has preserved for us many, and Clement also single ones, and the author of the extracts from Theodotus, in the works of Clement, very many quotations.

We must further remark that Hippolytus, who lived near Rome, or in that city itself, where all the heretics, or many

of their disciples, at least, resorted, possessed sources for obtaining the original ideas of the Gnostics which were unknown to Irenæus in Lyons, or even to Clement in Alexandria.

Although Hippolytus may fail in giving us accurately the different sources of the Gnostic philosophy or the connection of their ideas, this does not militate against the accuracy of his quotations from their writings.

Irenæus and Hippolytus differ greatly in talent and in the object of their writings. Irenæus is not philosophical, but practical. His object was to show the *unchristian* character of Gnosticism. He has, in accordance with his own statement, set forth the doctrine of the Valentinians as represented in the writings of some of the disciples of Valentinus, especially of Ptolemæus and his party, and also from their conversations. Hippolytus is rather a philosophical intellect, so that he goes back to the founders of the sects in order to show the origin of their different ideas and their connection with the Greek systems.

But in the principal point, all those who give us accounts of the Gnostics agree. Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, and Hippolytus represent them as quoting and arbitrarily explaining in support of their systems passages from the Old and the New Testament. As the Gnostics wished to recommend their systems as Christian, there was no other course left to them.

Had these quotations in Hippolytus, and likewise the extracts from Theodotus and the Oriental school in the works of Clement of Alexandria, been taken from the later Gnostics, among the more than one hundred and sixty passages there would not indeed have been found merely two or three out of an Apocryphal Gospel, and in general also passages from writings which at a later period were added to the Books of the New Testament. We know how Irenæus complains respecting the numerous Apocryphæ which the Gnostics in his time made use of, and how not only Clement of Alexandria considers the Epistle of Barnabas to be Holy Scripture, but also in the Codex Sinaiticus Barnabas and Hermas, and in the Codex Alexandrinus the Epistle of Clement of Rome is added to the New Testament. But in the quotations out of the old Gnostics in Hippolytus we find not a

single one of these books cited. Can any other reason be assigned for this than that they at that time were not in existence, or had not yet come into use, at all events were not esteemed?

De Groot refers to the Syrian Cerdo, one of the very oldest of the Gnostics, as confirming Hippolytus's statement of the way in which Basilides quotes. Cerdo lived in Rome, in the time of Bishop Hyginus, (139–143,) and had for his disciple Marcion. Theodoret cites several words from this Cerdo, in which he makes a distinction between the God of the Jews and the Father of Jesus Christ. The former, says Cerdo, commands in the law to strike out an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but the good God commands in *the Gospels* that we shall offer the left cheek to him who smites us on the right, etc.

Results and Inferences.

Already in the times of the Apostles communications were made by letters, which passed from one society to another. (Acts xv, 23–29; xvi, 4; Col. iv, 16.) There were already widely circulated written accounts of the life of Jesus even before Luke wrote his Gospel. About the end of the first or beginning of the second century the commencement of a collection of writings on the Life of Jesus was already made, known as "Gospels," which were widely spread from Palestine especially, (Eusebius, III, 37,) and of Epistles, at least of Paul and Peter, which Gospels and Epistles were used in the earliest period as containing the only trustworthy accounts and views of the life and works of Jesus.

They immediately began to be placed, as holy writings possessing authority, on a par with the books of the Old Testament. For Basilides, the younger contemporary of the last surviving Apostle, was acquainted with such a collection—to which belonged at least the Gospels of Luke and John, and several Epistles of Paul, with one of Peter—and quoted from these and from the Old Testament exclusively proofs for his system, and wrote twenty-four Books of Expositions of the Gospel. Also Cerdo, a younger contemporary of Basilides, was acquainted with such a collection of Gospels, (about the year 135,) which he contrasted with the law of Moses.

This collection of writings of the New Testament arose neither accidentally, nor in consequence of critical investigations, nor through the ordinance of a synod, but it had its origin in the interest felt for every thing that proceeded from the Apostles and their companions. It was adopted upon the testimony of reliable men who had associated with the Apostles. And when many spurious writings made their appearance, this collection was carefully separated from them by the sound judgment of the Christians and carefully preserved. In exercising this judgment they were governed by external and internal evidence.

The possibility of the enlargement of this collection was soon obviated; for only the Apostles, and a very few of their companions, were filled with the Holy Spirit, by means of which they were enabled to write down the words of God. Upon the whole, a chasm so deep and wide separates the writings of the Apostles from those of their companions that the writings of the latter, with the exception of a very few books which we have from them in the New Testament, (for example, the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and the Epistle to the Hebrews,) could be regarded by only a few Christians as sacred writings.

Before the middle of the second century the greatest part of our present New Testament was known to the Gnostics of that period, who quoted passages from it in support of their system. Of this, Basilides, the Ophites, and Valentinus are examples. Valentinus, who set up his system in the time of Hadrian, (117–138,) made use of the Four Gospels and many other Books of the New Testament. Marcion and Cerdo likewise used a part of the New Testament.

In the numerous quotations of the Gnostics from the New Testament there is, with few exceptions, an entire absence of quotations from apocryphal writings. Only the Gospel of Thomas, in the midst of one hundred and sixty-seven passages out of the New Testament, is once cited, and it is mentioned that the doctrine of the Ophites agrees with the Gospel of the Egyptians.

But so far as these apocryphal writings are ancient, they confirm the still greater antiquity of the canonical Scriptures; for the Apocryphæ are, as every body, even the Tübingen school, acknowledges, nothing more than (in the highest degree unsuc-

cessful) imitations and supplements of the canonical Scriptures. And as the Protevangel of James and the Gospel of Thomas arose before the year 150, it follows that our four canonical Gospels before this period were generally acknowledged as such.

That these books already at an early period were known and possessed unique authority among the Catholics is evident from the old Epistle of Barnabas, in which a passage is quoted out of Matthew as a testimony of SCRIPTURE; perhaps also from the EPISTLE of POLYCARP; certainly from the TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS; also from the very old Epistle to Diognetus.

All this can be confirmed by the authority of F. C. Baur, namely, the credibility of Hippolytus, the age of Basilides, Valentinus, and Heracleon; the antiquity of the Ophites; the use of the writings of the New Testament by the oldest Gnostics; their forced allegorical explanation of these Scriptures, and the custom of the Catholics in appealing to the living preaching against the Gnostics.

The quotations of the earliest Gnostics are made from the very same Gospels that we possess. And there is not the slightest indication (quite different from the Apocryphal Gospels, which depart so widely from each other) that in the time of Basilides, a contemporary of the last surviving Apostle, or in that of the Ophites or of Valentinus, our Gospels existed in any other form than that in which we now have them.

The pretended results of the historical criticism of the Tübingens on the late origin of most of the books of the New Testament are hereby once for all refuted. There exists for the antiquity and genuineness of the principal Books of the New Testament such a connected series of old and certain testimonies as can scarcely, if at all, be found for any other writings of the earlier centuries. Most clearly can this be shown of that writing which has been most disputed—the Gospel of John.

In our next article we shall give the substance of De Groot's arguments in proof of the apostolical origin of this Gospel.

Art. II.—THE MUSCOVITE AND THE TEUTON.

There is, in the mighty realm of the Czar, a new and aggressive movement on the part of the enthusiastic Russians, who look more to the half-barbaric splendor of the past than to the need of the present or the glory of the future against all nationalities that are not of Sclavonic origin; and there is, at the same time, an almost insane effort on the part of these same Russians to incorporate into their national *plexus* every tribe or nationality that can possibly be construed as belonging to the Sclavonic family.

Thus modern Russia aspires to the proportions of that fabled giant that needed to stoop to enjoy a view of his own limbs, while at the same time he would undertake the stern task of assimilating to himself all that his long arms can reach, so that we monthly listen to the story of new conquests on the shores of the Caspian or the confines of the Eastern Pacific. But this digestion is by no means always perfect; and the object of this article is to treat of a case which is just now causing Russia considerable uneasiness and discomfort.

The German element has long exerted a controlling influence in civilizing and refining Russia. The army of Peter the Great was largely commanded by German officers, who thus, in the earliest days of Russia's national existence, performed a great part in giving her strength, form, and organization. When the State was fairly formed, it was German publicists and statesmen who molded and developed her internal affairs, and German diplomatists who cultivated and guided her foreign policy and relations. Thus German became the language of her army and her court, and the vehicle for the transfer of foreign culture to her soil. For many years there was scarcely a teacher within her realm who was not a German, and all science and literature that came from without bore the Teutonic garb. The language of her schools was German, as was that of her scientific bodies. Only one short year ago the Academy of Natural Sciences of St. Petersburg resolved hereafter to transact their sessions and publish their proceedings in Russian.

The industrial interests of Russia were fairly built up by

German artisans and mechanics. They manned her factories, ran her workshops, worked her mines, and were the first to develop nearly all her internal resources. Her steam-engines and steamboats were largely constructed and commanded by Germans, and in later years these same men have done a portion of labor in the introduction of railroads and telegraphs, sharing these enterprises with English and American capitalists, machinists, and mechanics. Under these circumstances it is not wonderful that the Germans have exerted a controlling influence in Russia, amassing wealth, and filling the most significant positions in every sphere of the Empire. Large numbers of them have emigrated to Russia to find less crowded fields of enterprise than at home, and have settled permanently throughout the land. Some authorities count them by millions, and others make them less numerous, the numbers given varying according to the interest of the statistician, in the absence of any very definite enumeration.

But after having furnished the leading-strings for the infant nation, and taught him all the true elements of national greatness, the rapidly maturing giant, outgrowing these teachers and becoming jealous of them, is now turning on those who showed him wherein lay his strength. Modern Russia is so rampant that Germany can now scarcely live in the same house with him, and in some parts of the realm there is open and declared war between the German and the Russian elements. It is becoming a part of the creed of advanced Russians to despise every thing that is German, and to imagine that they are already equal to their teachers if not superior to them. These latter, therefore, are to be stamped out or Russianized in matters of language, religion, and nationality. And this ungrateful and unmanly task is now the main endeavor of the Russian party, which is as blind as it is assuming. Russia is far from being able to dispense with German skill and genius, patience and culture, and, in its selfish efforts to do so, it is depriving itself of its most valuable instruments for developing its resources and keeping in the true path of national greatness.

The immediate scenes of these internecine troubles are the Russian provinces of the Baltic known as Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia: these extend along the southern shore of this

sea, from the Prussian frontier to the Gulf of Finland, and approach St. Petersburg. One hundred and fifty years ago the Germans began to creep along these shores and settle in the interior, and their advent was favored by the Russian Government, as were their rights and privileges guaranteed by treaty. They have long been the ruling race in these regions, and their farms, and schools, and workshops have been the nurseries whence the Empire has drawn its young and cultivated forces for new enterprises and development. But they are and desire to remain Russians as to their national obligations, preserving their language and their Lutheran religion. Nearly all classes are Germans except the peasants, and these latter are of course quite numerous, and could become a formidable element in a national collision so near the borders.

Now Russia assails and pretends to fear the German predominance in these provinces, and is resolved to root it out by fair means or foul. The pretense that, in case of national collision, they would side with Prussia, is declared to be totally unfounded, as the mass of the strong arms is found in the Russian peasantry, and their German leaders have all grown up with national ties and interests in Russia. On the other hand it is equally unwise to believe, as is universally affirmed by the Russian press, that Prussia desires to possess these provinces, and is looking toward them with eager eyes. They contain so large a proportion of foreign population that it would be a blind ambition, indeed, that would aspire to possess them. Prussia has a far nobler task before her than that of indulging in foreign conquest—it is that of uniting all the different German nationalities into one strong and invincible Teutonic brotherhood, and in this she can reap far more honor and renown than in any wild foreign conquest.

The days of crossing national frontiers and appropriating a neighbor's territory will, we hope, soon be among the things of the past in Europe, as there is just now scarcely a boundary line that could be infringed upon without bringing about a European contest. Germany desires no extension of its territory, and simply wishes no interference from outsiders, as France and Russia, in internal consolidation. The fear of Russia of being molested in its territorial lines is wholly

groundless, and is, in fact, but little more than a most patent case of judging its neighbor by itself. The Baltic Provinces are a sure possession of the Russian crown, quite as much so as any other of its provinces. If there were to-morrow a coalition between Russia and France to dismember and destroy Germany, these provinces would be found on the side of Russia. There is, therefore, no real sympathy, in a national point of view, between the Germans of these provinces and the Germans of Germany proper. The latter feel for their brothers in these lands as for men that are oppressed in their adopted homes, but extend their sympathy no farther. The real German has no more love for Russia than for France, for he is equally despised and detested in both of these countries, and owes them no love.

Thus the question of Russianizing the Baltic Provinces is in no sense a German one, so far as the German nation is concerned; the latter has but little real interest in the matter. But it is a question of immense import to Russia in the study of its own real and true interests in its national development. Russia is still a barbarous and uncultivated territory, except in and around its few cosmopolitan centers, and it cannot, in reality, afford to cut off those sources of refinement, skill, and culture, that the Germans are sustaining in its own bosom for its own use. And it is this proposition that we desire to develop and enforce in contradistinction to the views of the Russian party, which seems to feel that the German orange has been squeezed, and may now be thrown away.

If German diligence, German stability and learning and loyalty, have been useful to Russia in the past, they have still an ample field for their exercise in the future. It is the wildest folly to endeavor to destroy that healthy leaven that has already made the nation rise. In the one simple department of instruction, public and private, the Russians are almost wholly dependent on the Germans, from the highest walks of literature and science to the lowest grades of elementary instruction. However many good qualities the Russian may possess, he has no aptness for teaching. The few Russians that are successful in this field of labor have, almost without exception, drawn their inspiration from German sources, and are mainly pupils of the German institutions in these Baltic Provinces. Of the

nine Universities scattered throughout Russia, only one has any foreign reputation, and that is almost as wholly German as if it were in Germany: it is that of Dorpat, in one of those provinces. This institution is the great source of supply for teachers of higher grade throughout all Russia; while many of the Russian institutions, properly so called, are very weak in influence and small in numbers. Some find it a difficult task to obtain a competent Faculty to perform the labor of teaching.

Now to crush this University because it is essentially German in its nature were the wildest folly, and yet Young Russia would do this, and establish in its place a normal college in St. Petersburg for the training of teachers in Russian branches. The Germans of Dorpat very sensibly say to the Russians, Let us live with our well-supplied faculties in philology, mathematics, and jurisprudence, and found Government scholarships for the support of students who will bind themselves to study Russian thoroughly and afterward devote themselves for a series of years to teach in Russian schools. This would, certainly, be a far wiser method than for the Russians to vie with each other in destroying a nationality that is able and willing to assist the country in acquiring real strength and worth. In this way a goodly number of efficient scholars and teachers would be obtained, and the country would gain in skillful laborers and useful subjects. If the Russians were wise political economists they would certainly regard these German provinces within their boundaries, and wholly under their control, as sources of culture and profit and useful centers for the supply of what their growing nation now most needs.

But instead of cultivating this language, with its rich stores of wealth, the Russians are trying to stamp it out of schools and courts, Churches and society, and to introduce in its place a language comparatively uncultivated, and useless for the higher wants of the community. This they will clearly find a much more difficult task than they anticipate, as about the last thing to be eradicated from masses of men is their native tongue. It would be comparatively easy to procure civil officers possessing the language sufficiently well for all purposes of correspondence with the central government, and the children

of the schools would learn the Russian without compulsion if it offered them opportunities of civil or military promotion; and thus a good understanding might be maintained between the two nationalities, that would conduce to their mutual comfort and profit. But the Russian party prefer the crazy policy of Russianizing these provinces, and thus making them bitter enemies of the country in its very midst. The Prussians have and desire to have no voice in the matter; they simply say, "If you and the Russians can stand it we can; and when you get thoroughly disgusted and discouraged with it, gather up your household gods and come back to us and we will receive you."

Germany and Russia are just now on good terms; but will that last for ever? Quite impossible. The Germans fear the Russian desire of conquest about as much as that of the French. The day may not be far distant when these two countries will join hands to oppress Germany. It would not be the first time. If, in the preparation for this coming struggle, Russia can afford to do without the culture and intelligence of the Germans within its border, Germany certainly can; and if Russia, in its hatred of Germany, can forbid its youth to frequent German Universities, at a later period these institutions may refuse to open their doors to Russian students.

A powerful and a willing instrument in this destructive warfare is the Russian press, which is mostly in the hands of these ultra-Russians. For the last ten years its attacks have become more and more violent, until they now scarcely remain within the arena of common justice. It now demands confiscation of property, extinction of ordinary rights, suppression of language, and abolition of the Protestant Church. This is war to the knife! And, unfortunately, the Government yields to these attacks if it does not encourage them; finding it much more easy and congenial to sail with the Russian current than to stem the tide and maintain a parental relation to all its children. Thus it is ever curtailing the privileges of the provinces by filling the important offices with Russians from the interior, while the officials who are suspected of German sympathies are displaced for the slightest cause, or for no cause at all. These Russian intruders soon make themselves at home and assume the bearing of conquerors, because they know they are

supported by the powers around the throne. They force their language on those who would transact business with them, and even make their religion offensive by flaunting it in the face of Protestants and Lutherans.

These measures are carried so far on individual responsibility as to produce a healthy reaction in the public mind, and stir up the lukewarm to activity, and a true sense of the danger of the power that is consolidating itself in their midst. The public spirit of the people has had a rapid growth during the last few years, and is gradually rising to the dignity of an active opposition. Men, like nations, will bend to a mild yoke, though they may feel its burden; they may, indeed, become so gradually accustomed to it as hardly to perceive its weight; but when the oppressor oversteps all bounds they throw off the heavy load and find it a task to submit even to the lighter one of earlier days. Thus the very measures of the enemy are assisting the German leaders in opening the eyes of the people, and making them an active force in the contest. But, in return for this, the Russian Government is trying to get rid of this difficulty by transporting the masses bodily into Russian provinces, and filling their places by genuine Russians to the manor born.

Some thirty years ago a proposition of this kind was started in St. Petersburg, with a view to Russianize the Baltic Provinces at once. The plan was nothing less than an exchange of population between these countries and the plains of Southern Russia, and the peasants were induced to accept it by the promise of free lands in the warm and sunny South. It was soon found that this would cost more than its originators had estimated, and it assumed no great proportions on account of the immense expense attendant on such emigration. But it was not entirely given up, and is still spasmodically pursued in the absence of any thing more effectual. It has of late received a new impetus from the sad fact that for a few seasons past the crops have nearly failed in all these regions, so that famine and consequent disease have made fearful ravages among the people. This has induced them to turn a more willing ear to these propositions of expatriation, and leave their homes in hope of bettering their condition. The most cheerful prospects were held out to them; every thing was to be prepared

for their comfortable reception, and they had nothing to do but go South and take possession of rich and genial lands. Thus allured, hundreds of the Baltic peasants determined to form a pioneer colony; they sold for a song all that they could not take with them, and with good cheer departed for their new home on the banks of the Volga. Here they found barren plains, warm enough in summer, but fearfully cold in winter and destitute of fuel for warmth. They were obliged to build their own houses and make a raw soil fertile in a species of desert far from the conveniences of civilization. The rest of the story is soon told; some enriched the soil with their bodies, others in sorrow and privation sought refuge in neighboring provinces, and a very few again saw their native homes as beggars.

Notwithstanding these sad stories, other colonies have occasionally set out for different regions, with other attractions and promises. These enterprises have generally been undertaken against the advice of all the German influence—teachers, preachers, and local officers—that could be brought to bear upon them, and have generally had the same sad result, as indeed might be expected of an ignorant and inexperienced body of men unacquainted with the language, unprotected by contracts, and uncertain as to the location of the lands to which they seemed led like sheep to the slaughter. The season just passed has seen some of these companies set out with ox and ass, and cart containing the household gods of those desperately intent on seeking an alleviation of their sufferings, and most probably going directly to the sacrificial altar. Artisans and mechanics have been drawn away by thousands toward the interior cities through the most attractive promises of constant labor and generous wages; the Government has taken even more pains to lure these from the Provinces than the peasants, because they are more purely German in speech and character, and, therefore, more dangerous when together in masses than when scattered throughout the realm among the Russian people. Special privileges have been granted to contractors on public works to go with the government shield into these provinces to draw away from them their most skilled mechanics. This is the process of Russianizing the Baltic Provinces, which turns out to be one rather of devastation and

depopulation, as few Russians can be induced by the Government to come and take the places of any but Government officers.

But the sphere in which this conflict becomes most sensitive and delicate, and the one in which it most deeply affects all the provinces, is that of religious belief and observances, for this affects all classes alike, and therefore most closely binds them in a common interest without regard to locality or language. The original and hereditary Church of nearly all the Germans in these provinces is the Lutheran. This form of Protestantism was transplanted with them to the soil in the earliest emigrations, and for a time they were allowed to enjoy their belief not only unmolested, but even under the protection of certain constitutional safeguards. But in the course of time it became apparent to the Russian authorities that a Lutheran Church on Russian soil might interfere seriously with the process of naturalization, and they commenced a series of measures, covert and open, to induce the Germans to abandon their belief and accept the Greek Church. For a time rewards and threats became quite effective, for there seemed in this matter to be a period of comparative indifference, and during this time the Government succeeded in having many of the children baptized in the Greek faith, and claiming all for this faith which were the offspring of mixed marriages.

The tide of reaction set in, however, after a time, and about six years ago the feeling in regard to the matter rose to the highest pitch. When the children baptized in the Greek Church began to see that this was to separate them from their families in a matter of extreme delicacy to all men, they became violent in their demands to be permitted to worship according to the faith of their fathers, and neither threats nor punishment sufficed to compel them to render obedience to the Greek priests. The whole land was deeply moved, and the result was that at a Diet sitting in Riga petitions and appeals came in showers from the clergy, scholars, and ordinary citizens, led on by large numbers of the titled classes. They claimed their old constitutional right of liberty of conscience, and besought the privilege of returning to the mother Church. The news of this unusual excitement reached St. Petersburg, and the Emperor decided to send a special commissioner to

make a tour through the country and report to him directly. By chance the charge fell upon an honest man, and his report did more toward unmasking Russian intrigue and bringing the true state of the case to the throne than any thing that has occurred during the whole controversy.

Count Bobrinsky, this Commissioner, visited but two circuits, being convinced when this was accomplished that his mere presence would call out immense demonstrations in favor of the Protestant religion. In one district he summoned an assembly of Greek priests, and put to them the direct question, whether a majority of their parishes were in favor of retaining and remaining in the State or Russian Church? Their reply was clearly negative, though against their desires and interests. In another district he bid two members from each congregation to meet him, and expected to see twenty-four delegates. He was favored with the presence of four hundred. In the next village six hundred men had gathered at the report of his coming, and in the next one thousand, until he was at last obliged to inform the authorities that he would absolutely refuse to confer with more than the number of delegates he had commanded to appear. Everywhere the people plead with him, with tears in their eyes, to carry their appeals to the throne for permission to return to the Lutheran faith, or at least to have their children thus baptized. Some fifteen came with a desire to remain in the Greek communion, presenting at the same time petitions for Government places. These interviews were all in the presence of the national priests, so that the restraint thereby exerted was decidedly in their favor. It was clearly developed that those who had left the Lutheran Church had not in conviction gone over to the Greek. They were thus virtually without any religious influence, and their moral condition was proportionally low. Of the number claimed in the statistics as belonging to the national Church not more than one tenth could be claimed as having any sympathy with it.

The report of the commissioner was honestly made to the Emperor Alexander, in accordance with this sad experience, accompanied with the regret that so many were untrue to the orthodox faith of the Empire, and the recommendation that they be permitted to return to their own faith, with the addition of the assurance that those who had abjured their faith

in 1845 had done so in the hope of improving their material condition, and that the children who had been baptized in the faith since that period now repudiated the action of their parents.

This report was by no means what the Emperor desired or expected; and, although he entertained the highest respect for a tried and faithful officer, he did not feel inclined to yield too easily to his suggestions. An audience of dignitaries was summoned to the Palace immediately, to listen to the Count's report, but among them was also the Archbishop of Riga, an ardent advocate of compulsory religion. This fact showed that the Emperor was not inclined to yield without a struggle. This Church official contested the truth of Bobrinsky's conclusions at least, and affirmed that a hasty journey of ten days gave him no opportunity to learn the true state of the case. He demanded the privilege of spending the summer among the parishes of his diocese, to have full opportunity to learn for himself the true state of the case. The Emperor, not having the least doubt of the character of this prelate's report, bid him do as he had suggested.

The adoption of this measure destroyed the hopes of the German Lutherans. The Archbishop came among them, but not on a pastoral visit in the true sense of the term. The so-called converts who desired to present to the hierarch their petitions to be permitted to return to the Church of their choice were intimidated with threats, and, when these were not successful, were overwhelmed with abuse at the very altars. In one instance a young Lutheran, who owed his connection with the Greek Church to the action of his parents, appeared as the representative of his colleagues, bearing an appeal to be released from bonds that bore heavily on their consciences. The Archbishop, in his anger at the self-possession of the appellant, declared him and his to be scabby sheep that would mar the whole flock, adding that they deserved to be expelled from the only true and orthodox Church. But the young peasant, who had a ready tongue, took advantage of this hasty and untimely accusation, and turning to his comrades, said: "You have heard that his Eminence declares us worthy of expulsion from the orthodox Church; let us go!" And in this mood the whole congregation followed him, leaving the

angry Archbishop and his train of priests in sole possession of the church.

Finding that this line of action did no good, the prelate undertook the investigation of the material condition of the peasants and laboring classes generally, and taught them that their troubles came mainly from the injustice of the proprietors and the inequality of the laws regarding them, declaring also to the German portion of the community that in many respects civil obligations had not been fulfilled in regard to them. These were such palpable truths that they commanded attention, and succeeded in turning their minds from religious to civil questions, and thus stirred up the whole province in political broils, in the midst of which the religious activity became weak, and indeed for a time was nearly suspended. The Archbishop had effected his purpose, and so had the Emperor; the Church question was smothered for the nonce, and the civil one could be handled by the civil authorities if it became troublesome. The distinguished services of the Archbishop were rewarded by the Emperor in the form of a diamond cross for the episcopal cap.

Of the many peculiar incidents that have attended this special struggle we give a few of those at our command, to show how deeply they penetrated into those domestic matters that we are accustomed to consider sacred from intrusions of any kind whatever. A high official of one of these provinces had married a lady who was a compulsory member of the Greek Church; she had been baptized in that faith. This fact was enough to constitute a mixed marriage, although the gentleman was a Protestant. A son was born to him, whom it was necessary to have baptized and placed on the Church records to give him a legitimate and legal status. The father determined to break the ban resting on mixed marriages, and assert his natural and parental right to bring up his child in the faith that he professed. He applied to a Lutheran clergyman to perform the rite; the latter could not do this without an open violation of the law, and refused. The father, permeated with the conviction of his faith that a child unbaptized is exposed to eternal condemnation in case of early death, resolved to perform the ceremony himself. This soon brought the diademed Archbishop into the strife; he brought an accusation against

the father, who was summoned to answer the charge before the Court tribunal of Riga. The State's attorney demanded one year's imprisonment in the penitentiary, his child and all children of his marriage to be taken from him and given over to believers in the orthodox faith, to be reared and educated in that belief. After a long trial the Court had the honest independence to give a verdict of acquittal. This decision was extensively illustrated by reference to Russian law and that of the provinces, as well as to capitulations and treaties, but was unfortunately marred in not being extended to all the provinces on account of special laws in some of them. An appeal was made to the High Court of St. Petersburg, where the matter dragged on for a long time, when the Emperor quashed the proceedings without any formal decision. The result was a decided victory against the Greek Church, but the proceedings produced a great degree of exasperation, seeing that this organization was so obstinately determined to interfere in the most delicate relations of domestic life.

The result of this trial of strength emboldened other Protestants that were parties to mixed marriages to bring up their children in their own faith. A lady of rank of the Reformed Church, whose husband was a compulsory Greek, also baptized her child herself. The case created great excitement, but she was not molested by the Greek priests, as they feared another rebuff from the courts. A still bolder act was perpetrated over a year ago by another lady of rank, who had also been forced into the Greek Church; she received the communion from the hands of an evangelical clergyman according to the Lutheran ritual, which of course excluded her from the Greek communion. She was prepared for the worst, but it was not thought advisable to interfere with her. These examples from above soon had their influence on the classes below. Two Lutheran women of the people of mixed marriage endeavored to withhold their children from Greek baptism. In one case, only a week after the birth of the child, the Greek priests appeared in the chamber of the mother and demanded the child for baptism. The mother begged a respite of a few weeks, when she would bring the child herself; but the priest became violent, and threatened father, mother, and nurse with imprisonment and transportation to Siberia. This so frightened the latter that

she snatched the child from the arms of the mother and gave it to the priest, while the excitement threw the mother into a dangerous fever and temporary insanity. In the other case the priest dragged the child away by main force, and it suffered so much by the violence and exposure that it died in a few days. The fathers of both children sued the priests, but after a sort of Chancery trial they were all acquitted. These outrages have greatly exasperated the people, and made the Greek priests still more unpopular. Just at this moment both parties stand in the sharpest antagonism to each other.

We can scarcely conclude this paper without devoting a few moments to the educational phase of this controversy, with the view of calling attention to the vast contrast between the Russian institutions properly so called, and those that exist in the Baltic Provinces under the German influence. As we have before observed, the Government finds it almost impossible to fill the chairs of the Universities in the interior. The University of Charkove has fourteen professorships now vacant, and this in the face of extraordinary efforts on the part of the Ministry of Instruction to supply them with teaching force, such as increase of salary, and foundation of scholarships for the training of instructors in foreign schools; and a recent issue of the "Odessa Journal" announces that the new University of that city needs a dozen professors, and in some cases for its most important chairs. Contrast this with the famous school of Dorpat in the Baltic Provinces, and Young Russia suffers severely. And the flourishing character of this school is maintained in the presence of difficulties arising from all sorts of petty interference on the part of the Government, and these have been long continued. Nicholas made every effort to reduce this University to a mere preparatory school for the education of civil officers, while its aspirations are to be the seat of the highest learning and culture of the realm. Alexander has treated it a little more kindly, but is determined to Russianize it as far as it can possibly bear it. No student may enter its halls without an extensive knowledge of the Russian language. This is an absolute impediment to many a young man who has no means or no inclination to acquire the Russian, and no use for it after all the labor devoted to it. The result is that not a few are turned away from a

learned career by the stumbling-blocks that are laid in their way.

About a year ago the Chief Inspector of the University and all the high schools of the provinces was ordered to correspond with the Ministry at St. Petersburg in the Russian tongue. It was known that the incumbent could not do this, and the intention was to get rid of him in this way, as it was supposed that he would resign; but he retained his post in the interest of his cause, and protested against the action. The result was the appointment of an ingrained Russian as sub-inspector, to do the correspondence, act as informer to the Government, and be ready to step into the place the moment it is vacant. One of the finest of the corps was recently displaced on account of the publication of a pamphlet reflecting on the ungenerous pressure of the authorities on the development of the institution. His place is still vacant and likely to be, since the Government has now determined that he who fills it must be able to deliver the lectures on Russian and Baltic history in Russian, and the national journals are now insisting that the lectures on Russian law must also be delivered in that tongue. The Emperor Nicholas had his own peculiar way of getting rid of uncongenial teachers; a mere suspicion or a simple dislike was enough to settle his purpose, and when a man was unfortunate in this way his fate was sealed. A noted teacher, now doing good service in Switzerland, found himself suddenly seized one day, placed in a carriage, and, under escort of a band of Cossacks, set down beyond the frontier, with an emphatic hint not to cross it again.

For the last three years efforts have been made to introduce the Russian into the high schools as a medium of instruction. History and mathematics were to be taught to mere boys in Russian; why just these branches is not so clear, as no one is aware that the language is especially rich or efficient in either of them. Thus far the effort has failed from sheer inability to carry it out. The children themselves are so set against it that they give it the nickname of "Arabic," and will neither study nor speak it unless forced to do so. If these branches are to be studied in Russian the youth of the provinces will know very little about them. But one great trouble that the enterprise meets in the beginning is to find native teachers of

the language. In all the Russian realm there is not a single normal school for the training of teachers; while in the provinces there are no less than four. The result is so great a dearth of Russian teachers that it is said that even in Moscow a good teacher of Russian is not easily found. Under these circumstances the Germans of the provinces recommend that when one by chance comes to light, it were wiser to employ him in their own cities than to send him to the high schools of the Baltic. The German population of all this region is remarkably well-educated; it is seldom that one is found who cannot read and write: the very peasants in the fields carry their hymn and prayer books with them to escape the eyes of the national priests, and the authorities declare that the proportion of their people that can read and write is even greater than in Prussia.

A systematic effort to force the Russian language on the country was made by ukase in 1869. The Emperor declared that all the crown authorities in the provinces should correspond with each other and with the superior authorities at the seat of Government in Russian. These national officers are few as yet, for nearly all are local; but these few could not do it, and the measure is still imperfectly carried out. Shortly after its publication, the Emperor, on a general tour, visited Riga, and for the first time addressed the delegations in Russian, which few of them can understand, and which he himself can scarcely speak so effectively as he can the German, on account of the great superiority of the latter language over his own. The whole affair caused great exasperation, and set the entire press of the country by the ears in its discussion. The organs of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kiev make it a standing subject of debate, and preach from it the most proscriptive propositions, and thus the war goes on.

This gives the Russian party a capital chance to declaim about national unity and the incongruity of a foreign element in their midst, and this they do with little regard to the fact that these provinces are united to Russia by a series of solemn compacts extending over one hundred and fifty years, in nearly all of which distinct constitutional concessions are made to local language and religion. If the hotspurs of Russia could find time for a little investigation into general history they

would there find that about the hardest task a nation can undertake is to stamp out the language of another. They themselves have been trying the experiment on the Poles for a goodly period, and have not succeeded, though here the task should be more easy from the affinity of idiom and the total subjugation of the nation. In the case of the German provinces the undertaking is still more wild and unreasonable, from the fact that these may be made a source of strength and culture for the whole vast realm in its present career of progress and ambition.

Art. III.—OUR SPOKEN ENGLISH.

It was a wise conjecture of Mr. Marsh, that the new and altogether unparalleled strain put upon the English language in this country by the use of the literary dialect for all purposes, by all sorts of people, would result in new forms of phonetic corruption. It is the first experiment of democracy in speech. Hitherto the literary classes have had their choice, ripe, and flowing idioms mostly to themselves, and the circle has been so narrow that it has been easy to maintain a nearly uniform practice in orthoëpy, as well as in orthography. To this day, in all lands but ours, the masses speak dialects which they often share with the cultivated, who have, besides the common vernacular, a book-tongue for solemn or grave occasions. An Italian professor talks to his servants, wife, and children in dialect, but lectures to his students in the stately tongue used in books. In other countries, especially England, the dialects are less universally spoken; but every-where outside of America the rude, vulgar idiom is separated by a pretty broad line from its polite brother, and so takes off the brunt and waste of the worst sorts of usage.

Have we American-English dialects? Some facts favor an affirmative answer. There are certainly well-defined dialectical peculiarities. Two considerations, however, lead us to deny to these Americanisms the dignity or degradation of a dialect.

On the one hand, they only partially vary the spoken language; are rather hints of coming corruption, than systematic and universal corruption. Even a Hoosier speaks prevailingly in the book-language. On the other hand, none of these dialectical tendencies are the outgrowths of old, popular dialects. Making an exception here and there for a transplanted provincialism, most of our popular peculiarities are corruptions of book-words by people who did not inherit a low-born vernacular. The collision of languages in our country has developed some popular words which are not properly called dialectic, being nearly legitimate formations, and passing readily into the written tongue. *Hunker* might be cited as an example. It might be added that the incessant intermixture of our population by intermigration prevents the stagnation of any group of peculiarities into a vernacular for a province. It is difficult to see how a dialect can form under such conditions as ours,* and it is easy to believe that the old dialects of Europe must yield to the railroad and the school-master. The breaking up of a popular idiom in dense communities, where most are little learned in books, where all know their fellows from their youth up, and strange faces are rarely seen, is just such a task as the breaking up of a national speech. The Russian Emperor, who has attempted the last in Poland, would probably discourage our hope that Italy and Germany will succeed in the former.

It is quite another matter for a dialect to form in a population whose elements are changing every year. Only a national speech, however badly it be treated, can serve as a means of communication among the inhabitants of a village peopled from all parts of a vast nation. In spite of the varieties of accent, the mixture in some sections of different languages, and the broadly marked peculiarities of other sections, we conclude that we neither have, nor can ever have, true dialects. In a few years you may listen vainly for Hoosier on the Wabash or the Ohio,

* Professor Whitney is very hopeful of American-English, but he seems to think the danger of dialects to be worth some attention. "This [variety of usage] needs only a change in degree to make it accord with the distinction between any literary language which history offers to our knowledge, and any less cultivated dialects which have grown up in popular usage by its side, and by which it has been finally overthrown and supplanted." But when before, in human history, did a literary language have a national field all, or nearly all, to itself?—See *Language and the Study of Language*, p. 174.

and find all its peculiarities in every State of the Union, and many of them in that national literature which we are promised.

What we are to expect, and if possible avert, is the corruption of the literary language by every-day use on the tongues of a hundred millions of people scattered over half the surface of the globe, and mostly knowing a large part of their words at first only from books or newspapers.*

English orthoëpy is already subjected to severe pressure from the democracy, and it is doubtful whether the etymological canons will not have to yield to analogy established as a universal rule. So many people know how to read without knowing how to pronounce, our orthoëpical principles *are so entangling* to moderate intelligence, and the ignorant or half-educated may exercise such a constant pressure upon the educated few, that we are disposed to prophesy the victory of the people whenever they agree in opposing the scholars. If you wish to say *roman'ce* or *demon'strate*, you must daily fortify yourself against the influence of *ro'mance* and *dem'onstrate* hurtling into your ears from the popular tongue. Especially when words of foreign origin become an instrument of daily life, the pronunciation founded upon analogy must prevail. *Finance* will be accented on the first syllable by ninety-nine in every hundred Americans in spite of all the dictionaries and scholars, and before they are aware the scholars will be heard imitating the people.

It is worth considering whether these new popular conditions do not demand of scholars some effort to render our orthoëpy more simple, to come at first gracefully to concessions of things which will in the end be won even over their most stubborn resistance. There is no statute of limitations beyond which a word cannot wear a foreign accent. On one side, it parts with its brogue the next day after it gets into the newspapers; on the other, it keeps up a pretense of foreign flavor for an indefinite period. Since we have no rule ourselves, why not adopt the popular one?

In most cases the foreign air is sadly parodied in our speech. What Frenchman would recognize our *finan'ce?* It is neither French nor English; we have hung it up in an orthoëpical limbo,

* We refer here to the whole Anglican-tongued population of the world.

and will never have the courage to take it down. The people have naturalized it, and will force us to accept it as a citizen of the tongue. It is difficult to see why one of these changes from foreign to English pronunciation is any more safe or proper for extending through an indefinite period, and being accomplished only after a generation of scholars have wasted their protoplasm in nervousness and indignation at popular stupidity.

We have not yet fully comprehended that we are in a new world, which is not, and cannot be, governed by the few best speakers; certainly not upon the old system. Pure models in actual speech and the dictionary will both fail to reach the multitude, educated in the common schools, rushing into mercantile and political life, and becoming in turn models for admiring friends and constituencies. How few of them will ever doubt the application of the principle of analogy, or, if they doubt, will have or take the time to consult a dictionary. Orthography is in the hands of one or two hundred publishers, and these can successfully resist the ravages of democracy in the written forms; but the phonetic forms are under no such vassalage to any aristocracy.

The most that is now possible is to call attention to the influence of popular pronunciation, the difficulties of maintaining a heterogeneous orthoëpy, and the apparent necessity of modifying our canons, for accent at least, so as to give a wider application to the law of analogy, especially for new or recently-introduced foreign words.

A larger field is presented by the play of the laws of phonetic decay and renewal in the English spoken in America.

There is some vagueness in the use of the term phonetic decay, resulting from its application to three quite distinct linguistic phenomena. If all change is decay, the resolution of a consonant into its elements, or, more strictly, its separation into two or more letters, may be called decay; but whether it be a phonetic change is not absolutely settled, though it is probably such. In the Greek *dis*, and the Latin *bis*, (both from the Sanscrit *dvis*,) we probably have a labial and a dental developed from an older and more vague, or more complex, sound.* In the same way, a few early-formed consonants have furnished

* See Garnett's Philological Essays, p. 241.

by their expansion and division the consonantal wealth of modern tongues. This species of growth is so far removed from any proper decay that no case of it ought ever to be so designated.

Another set of phenomena involve *local* phonetic loss without affecting the sound-volume of the language. When *rondus* becomes *round*, local decay carries off the syllable *us;* but the sounds thus dropped from a word are retained in the speech, and local loss in number is attended with an increment in force. Scholars have attached great importance to these local losses, and not without reason, for they are the pivot of growth and decay in language. What they have sometimes failed to do is to mark the distinction between phonetic change affecting the sound-shell, and change in the intelligent contents of this shell. Max Müller's use of the French adverbial particle *ment* (Latin, *mente*) shows such a confusion of widely different things, the change noticed having but slightly affected the phonesis of the word in French, and not at all in Latin and Spanish. What has occurred is a change of meaning and use, arising from forgetfulness of the original meaning.*

There is still another set of facts, of wider application and more difficult of treatment, relating to the loss and renewal of the sounds of a language. Changes beginning in the attenuation of sounds are carried forward by the unconscious speakers until the phonetic elements concerned are pushed altogether out of the living tongue. These are true losses of phonetic wealth, even though they extend no further than the subtilizing of our vocal implements.

Unlettered dialects are probably protected by their poverty from being robbed by their speakers, who are believed to expend more energy upon their narrow phonesis than is used by cultivated people upon the same elements. The ear is so easily deceived in this kind of induction that one might challenge the claim for barbaric phonetic force if it did not seem to rest on well-supported principles. Since only so much strength will

* The attractive style of Max Müller disguises the logical blunder which runs all through his treatment of this subject. Phonetic decay riots in unwritten dialects, but is retarded or totally arrested in literary languages. Just the reverse statement is the key of Müller's argument. See "Science of Language," first series, pp. 54–70. All the changes referred to occurred in the dialectic stage.

be used for speaking, it is reasonable to assert that this force expended on a few sounds will give them greater volume than can be obtained when the same force is spread over a larger number. Besides, the barbarian or provincial peasant is believed to employ more energy in his vocal exertions than is usual in the elocution of his educated neighbors. It is to be desired that linguistic acoustics were enough studied, and sufficiently fortified by trustworthy observations, to justify implicit confidence in these general principles, for upon them rests the theory that dialects regenerate the phonesis of cultivated languages. That the ruder dialects renew the waste of words in the more advanced, but still unwritten ones, is established upon a very wide induction; but whether a quite modern form of waste, resulting from the preponderance of reading over speaking, and from other causes, is compensated by dialectic additions to vocabularies, and dialectic practice by their speakers, is a new question, dependent for its solution upon the relative strength, fullness, and volume of barbaric and provincial enunciation.

The question for this discussion is, Do we find reasons for believing that our spoken English is undergoing a process of gradual attenuation of its phonetic elements, and how far is this decay compensated by regenerating influences?

It may be that the opposing forces keep matters in even balance, but ours will not for that reason be a profitless inquiry. If there be any pleasure in witnessing a contest it is when the combatants are well-matched, and, if we are concerned for either contestant, we shall probably seek to lend him some assistance. Tendencies in language are often arrested by attracting public attention to what is going on.

Some general statements of facts neglected by our grammars will help us to estimate the problem. The first in order is the deficiency of our written notation. Our twelve English vowels are rather clusters of sounds than atomic elements. We see this in the *a* group, concerning which it has been debated whether there are four, five, six, or seven versions, and it is pretty clear that the evidence for more than four would make a good case for seventy while vindicating seven. There are two phonetic phenomena at the root of these diverging theories, one of which is that every new consonantal accompani-

ment slightly modifies the sound of the vowel, and the other is what the astronomers call the personal equation.

The same principles involve consonantal phonesis in a perpetual diversity. New combinations modify the several elements, and each man has his special rendering of all sounds, just as in a rural congregation every man may have a private notation for Mear or Dundee.* Of course the range of diversity is very narrow, and seldom passes the line beyond which it would be observed. It is only insisted that the variation exists, and establishes instability in what may be figuratively called the molecular constitution of our words. Dr. Latham speculates upon the fate of sounds which have become unstable; what destiny awaits a language all of whose phonal factors are already affected with instability? One thing seems clear, that is to say, that the slighter, feebler, more subtile forms may readily take precedence, and even monopolize the speech, if there be in operation causes tending to the diminution of the volume of sounds. The way is open for change; no implacable lines of law hem in and protect the phonetic atoms; each sound has already a great growth of resembling forms, and natural or artificial selection must do the rest. That such a result might occur, or rather that *some* change is to be expected, is sufficiently shown by the expansion of three or seven consonants into twenty or thirty in linguistic growth; and that a selection may take place in the elements of a sound really compound, is proved by the case of *bis* and *dis*, from *dvis*, already cited.

It is rather suggested than asserted that another general principle may be applied to our phonesis with valuable results. We know that barbarians usually have few sounds. The Polynesian dialects are given only seven or eight by the grammars, and so long as the people remain in a low intellectual condition we should not expect them to develop new consonants; but, looking at the history of language, we should expect civilization to enlarge their phonesis. Well, then, does culture lead people to discriminate in sounds? If it does induce division

* Instances of variation which are conceded may be cited. The Greek *spiritus lenis* is an aspirate generally omitted in notation. It occurs in *ache*, in sounding which a bubble of breath precedes the a. Our w and y in *wet* and *yet* are *coet* and *let*, to which, when sounded rapidly, an aspirate is added. This slight aspirate we mark; but in *union* the *io* takes on a stronger aspiration, which does not appear in our notation.

and increment, where does this tendency cease? Leaving out individual defects of acoustic apparatus for testing sounds, we must conclude that, since phonetic differences are produced and perceived by the intellect of man making use of vocal and hearing instruments, the more cultivated members of society must surpass the relatively ignorant in power to express a large phonetic notation. The complications of hereditary forces and early acquired habits are freely admitted. Still it may be believed that neither of these can permanently resist the backward movement of a language which, for other reasons, may be losing its phonetic wealth. If a people may rise from seven to twenty consonants through civilization, it cannot be doubted that they will return to seven when they fully return to barbarism.

How far the divergence of the many from the few in culture may affect phonetic expression is, of course, a matter of pure conjecture; that some divergence of phonesis will appear seems highly propable. We have an unusual proportion of readers in our population; but the really learned element is certainly not larger than in Germany, where the unlettered do not use the cultivated tongue. If we examine the facts we shall find that, although no completely satisfactory induction is possible, there is in our dialectic forms a decided tendency to obscuration or neglect of sounds. The writer has known persons in whose speech *a* had but three sounds; and every reader will bear witness that the sound of *a* in *command* is changed into another sound of the same letter by a large part of our population. The power to read does not confer the intellectual discrimination necessary for maintaining the integrity of phonal elements. We have, then, a phonetic apparatus brought to its present range of expression by the intellectual action of man rising into culture, and this instrument is placed in the hands, or mouth, of a whole population unprecedentedly, but still imperfectly, educated. Will they play the whole tune?

A profitable subject for observation would be to collect evidence upon the question whether reduction of the number of consonants and vowels is not an element in some of our dialectical variations.

With much less confidence that any useful result can follow inquiry, it is suggested that, since language never becomes so

wholly artificial as to escape utterly from the control of natural and intellectual laws, a transplanted phonesis may suffer from a change of natural and moral scenery. Man holds nothing simply because it has been once conquered from nature. Inventions, arts, and even languages have been lost. Our spoken English grew in another soil, its phonal music was learned in communion with other seas and mountains, and other climatic conditions favored the rendition by human organs of the sounds we are discoursing under new skies. Unhappily, we know less than we need to know how phonetic systems suffered or expanded in the old migrations; for it is open to a doubter to claim that the old alphabets do not cover the whole breadth of the phonesis.

Some precious facts, precious even though not altogether pleasant, seem to vindicate a place for natural law in the current movement of language. American elocution is less round and full-volumed than English, and ours is almost universally marked by a nasal quality unknown in the home-land of our tongue. It is amusing to hear the citizens of different sections accusing each other of a nasal twang which is heard all over our country.

The reduction of volume, especially in chest sounds, and the play of our noses in our English, would seem to be capable of only one explanation, and that is, that they are a tribute paid to the empire of climate. The only other supposition is pure conjecture, and applies to nasal sounds; that the collision of English in this country with many other tongues—the effect of these collisions reaching at length the whole body of our people—as with Dutch in New York, German in Pennsylvania, French in several sections, African dialects in the South, and Indian dialects every-where, that these collisions might, by some unknown phonetic equation, develop a nasal element in our language.

Even those changes which seem to be dependent upon our will are by no means under the control of caprice. All men naturally seek to reduce the exertions necessary to procure the satisfaction of their desires, or, to borrow from political economy, to buy in the cheapest market. It requires an effort to speak, and we observe here the same fact which appears in other fields of action, that man is not inclined to indulge in

superfluous industry. If a combination is difficult, it is made easy by changing or omitting sounds. We have an example in *strenth* for *strength*. Take this series of steps toward facility: *I do not know, I don't know, I don know, I'd 'now.* If the last will buy the goods, it will be the common currency.

Nothing is gained by calling this laziness; men are not required to do works of supererogation in language any more than they are in religion. For colloquial purposes the shorter forms are preferable; and we should not complain of their use if they could be set aside, branded dialectic, and restrained from mixing in literary society. But our dialectic abbreviations hover constantly on the verge of the cultivated speech, and form in us habits of negligence, which appear in the graver forms of expression. The evil fruit is gathered, not only in the lax utterance of speakers, but also in the accustoming of all ears to accept a part of a word, or a part of a sound, for the whole, in an intellectual refining of our speech down toward a barren symbolism. The moment we have reached a familiar acquaintance with the attenuated skeletons, we begin to loathe the full-fleshed and living harmonies as a kind of rant or affectation.

An example of a progress toward phonetic loss, attended with a repugnance to full enunciation, is afforded by the sound *r*, which has altogether lost with us its full rolling power. A faint shadow remains in our pronunciation of initial and final *r's*, but in medial positions it is now rarely heard at all. *Lord, word*, are uttered as though *r* had become a vowel; and the worst of it is, that these phonetic sinners are often people who ought to know better.*

But the worst feature of the case is, that a full *r* is unpleasant to our ears, being associated by some with vulgar bogs, being painful to most by its boisterous noisiness.†

The use of a literary speech for the household life of millions of people is an experiment, all the results of which cannot be

* The statement in the text is too favorable to our pronunciation of final *r's*. *Roar* is rendered *roah;* and one of our popular magazines once published a poem, with a chorus, in which the rhyme required a final *r* to stand for the sound of *a* in fall.

† Inasmuch as some of our Indian dialects are deficient in this sound, it is open to inquire whether climate is not an element in the change here noted.

wholesome. The volume of our phonetic elements must be affected by force of the general principle, that the needs of domestic life are satisfied by a narrower phonesis, and therefore the tendency must be steadily toward loss or attennation, as well as by the operation of special home influences among our people. On the rule that we do not habitually make needless vocal exertions, family life requires a minimum of phonal breadth.

The effects of isolation and familiarity, of common sympathies and employments, find their fullest result in the dialects of tribes; similar conditions in our households, taking up, as they do, an unusually large share of our lives, cannot be exactly similar, for we start with a different intellectual capital; but they cannot fail to appear somewhere in our speech. We may learn where to expect them by examining some less close associations.

A company of carpenters, working together and conversing about the technical matters of their trade, will unconsciously reduce their vocal efforts in technical terms to a minimum, and the inexpert would catch only a part of the sounds. But if one of these carpenters were required to speak with a person ignorant of the trade, he might quite unconsciously give a more distinct rendering of such terms; but this would depend upon the strength of his careless habits. A sailor, on the other hand, says *bos'n*, and scarcely recognizes a landsman's *boatswain* as the same word. The effect of these class associations is to cut down the words and sounds to the merest skeletons, not to say shadows.

Now in a larger way home-life attenuates the phonesis of our people, especially of our children. Many forms of speech have often to be repeated, and become so familiar that segments of them will represent the whole. Take a book and ask a child to read from another copy while you follow by the eye, and you will not need that he shall speak distinctly, for you know what he should say. In a similar way, we listen knowing what is to come, and stimulating our friends to hasten by significant signs that we are going faster than their tongues. So our vocal efforts insensibly fall to the actual necessities of the fireside.

Another element of this household corruption of speech is our familiarity with the habits of speech and intonations of the

persons with whom we pass most of our lives. The principle involved may be tested by a public speech. If we listen to one person weekly for years, our attention is less and less strained as we grow accustomed to his voice and elocution. A stranger in the same place will ask more attention without being less distinct in enunciation. The grammatical order of words, usually nearly invariable, also economizes attention in the household. The principle cuts a large figure in the formation of varieties in dialects.* A Swiss hotel servant will speak any European language with a faultless intonation; but he has really only learned a set of sentences by rote, and if you change the order of his words or your own he is immediately put to confusion. What is called "Pigeon-English" in China and San Francisco shows a yet more helpless dependence upon the recurrence of certain terminal sounds. In the family, children certainly learn words; but they also learn to look for them in set combinations, and to understand them when half uttered.

The household competes with the rostrum and the pulpit for the honor of fixing the standard of energy in utterance. Where dialects prevail in the family, the standard of correct taste is left to be maintained by public speaking of various kinds, in which the mere fact that many are to be addressed induces phonetic exactness. Italian is but slightly if at all affected by home use; it is only a public dress for thought, and the precision and exacting accuracy with which it is delivered is almost painful, and seems unnatural to foreign ears. It is nothing more, however, than the strange phenomenon of a whole and unmutilated phonesis being habitually reproduced. Contrast our own usage, which is so far short of this exacting precision that any speaker who should utter each sound distinctly would be listened to with pain and accused of affectation. Popular use of English in the family, and elsewhere, has probably produced this dislike of a full phonesis by familiarizing us with a kind of phonal symbolism in which a part represents perfectly the whole. Why should men make useless efforts? If clipped

* Differences between closely related dialects are largely made up of simple changes in the order of words, or the substitution of common words for each other, the phenomena of phonesis being identical throughout the group. The Genoese group is an illustration of this fact; and yet the inhabitants of conterminous valleys, or burghs, cannot speak with each other without a sense of difficulty.

coins pass current, who will pay a premium for unmutilated dollars? The tendency of popular usage to diminish volume of utterance is shown by some phenomena attending the learning of a foreign speech. One may perfectly master French under a teacher in New York, and yet be quite at a loss to understand the French heard in social life in Paris. The instructor unconsciously, or of set purpose, cultivates a full phonetic expression, such as is heard in the best public speaking. But only fractions, larger or smaller, of these phonetic elements are used by Frenchmen; the stranger must learn to take a part for the whole before spoken French will become intelligible. Foreigners, in whatever strange land they may wander, complain that the natives speak indistinctly. Even Italian, when used for conversation, loses some of it sphonetic richness; and if it ever becomes the social speech, even of the better half of the nation, its voweled magnificence must decline.

Another neglected orthoëpical phenomenon facilitates the ravages of carelessness in speaking English. At an early stage in a language there are commonly several canons of good taste which have about equal importance; but, by a kind of volitional-natural selection, some one of these takes the supreme place of law, and tends to destroy all the others. This *stress point* of orthoëpy is seldom, if ever, the same in two really distinct speeches. In Greek, it probably lay in the peculiarly perfect system of accentuation; in Latin the prosodical value of the vowels was, without much room to doubt, the field of orthoëpical stress. In Italian, the fullness of the vowels takes precedence of other canons; and in English, what we call accent devours all other rules.

One of the most obvious facts is that popular usage exaggerates the point of stress whenever it is simple enough to be popularly used at all. Genoese vocal expression is in this way a parody on the stress point of Italian, a reckless contempt of the rights of consonants, being one of its features.*

This tendency appears in English in the increasing laxity of the pronunciation of the unaccented syllables, accompanied by an increase of accentual stress. It is a common observation that vowels not under the accent lose their distinctive quality.

* Genoese elides the consonants, without blending the vowels, and four vowels are sometimes uttered one after the other in the same word. Besides, these vowels are as plump as Tuscan wheat.

Initial vowels suffer least, preserving in some cases (as *ache*) their proper sounds, but in others (as *accept* and *except*) falling into confusion before a consonant favored with the accentual prerogative. But, in the medial and final positions, popular pronunciation has no mercy for the individuality of vowels; they are all consigned to the limbo of a universal *u*. The identity of the spoken word seems to be passing into the accent, and, if this be placed where we are accustomed to find it, all the rest of the word is taken in fractions of sounds.

The stress of English orthoëpy is wonderfully simple and convenient for popular use; and, if proper care be taken in our public schools and colleges to counteract the tendency here noticed, we may congratulate ourselves on this happy facility of popularization; but should these tendencies continue at their recent rate of progress, we may find ourselves in the year 1950 with a national dialect rather than a national speech; or, if the statement be preferred, a spoken English departing widely from its *orthographical* brother.*

The universal diffusion of newspapers and books is another new fact in the history of languages, and the first and most marked results of this influence will appear in the English spoken in America. The period over which the action of this force has extended is so brief, that any discussion of it must partake of the nature of speculation. That considerable consequences must appear is evident from a mere contrast. Most languages have spent their lives mostly upon human tongues, rarely passing into literature at all, and then only for a very restricted form of existence. The ear has shaped, guided, and preserved their development. And in the outcome every language must submit to acoustic predominance.†

But our language is addressed very largely to the eye; and it is this which renders orthographical classicism so very easy, for all have a common interest in the conservation of familiar forms.‡ The contrast thus presented between them, for example, Anglo-Saxon and our American speech, raises an

* Space forbids illustration of a fact known to most readers, that English shows historical tendencies to this divorce of orthography and orthoëpy.

† That is to say, whenever a spoken tongue or dialect, departs widely from its orthography, a literature may be expected in the popular branch, and the classic will pass away.

‡ Orthographical (by a natural blunder usually called phonetic) reform is re-

expectation of wide-reaching consequences. Beyond this, we must advance by speculating upon the value and significance of a few facts; and any one may lawfully expound the facts in another and more hopeful manner.

The independence of the eye in reading is established only by much practice. From passages in the Latin rhetoricians, one may doubt whether the eye had obtained this emancipation among the educated classes at Rome. We observe that a child needs to repeat his words to his ear in order to understand them, and older persons of very little education seem to require the same acoustic aid to intelligence. The power to read silently is acquired by practice, and most readers of newspapers have mastered the difficulty. But when this power has been acquired, do the two renderings, oral and visual, subsist independently? Certainly not, at first. An attentive self-observer may detect a kind of muffled whisper going on while the eye runs over the symbols of sounds. It has been maintained that this mind-reading is always a reproduction of the sounds to the mental ear—the sounds are fancied, and if they are not the reading is interrupted. Whether this be universally and necessarily true is of course a matter for faith. We do observe, however, that we unravel tangled places by reading aloud or consciously muttering the different passages.

Practically, however, the eye acquires independence of the ear, and the written language becomes a mere symbolic notation divorced from any consciously known relation to sounds. The apparent necessity of phonetic expression is a fruit of habit, and passes away whenever vocal exercise is wholly relinquished for a considerable period.

If, therefore, a people read more than they speak, it would seem to follow that the spoken and written language would more and more separate; the latter becoming a notation for the eye, and the former ceasing to be under the control of the literary orthography. Even if the habit of reading cannot extinguish the phonetic accompaniment, it certainly can and does attenuate it, and the results in this case must be as disastrous as in that of total loss of a mental phonesis.

sisted by an overwhelming majority of those who form public opinion, and the democracy are here conservative. If you doubt, print books in a reformed spelling and see whether the masses will buy them.

These are some of the reasons for supposing that our spoken English is losing orthoëpic volume, and that, if the forces at work to produce decay are not arrested or checked, or balanced by counter-agents, the national speech will more and more separate from the old standards, lay aside phonetic elegance and compass, and become a popular dialect, with the novel peculiarity of being the speech of a continent.

The task of phonetic regeneration is usually performed by dialects, which locally renew by furnishing new compounds for those which have been corrupted to the verge of annihilation, and replenish the volume of phonesis by the interaction of dialect and language pronunciation. The dialect usually has fewer sounds with fuller volume, and, when its words pass into the language, they carry, and for some time retain, their wealth of lusty energy,* just as foreign words keep for some time their old accents. The effort to speak these words will extend to others, and so swell out the volume of the sounds affected. What our dialect does for one class of sounds, another may do for another class, and thus a living force, springing out of dialects, constantly renews the wasting literary speech.

English at home, that is, in England, is surrounded by a family of dialects which, doubtless, act powerfully against decay of phonetic energy. The dialect dictionaries give us from twenty thousand to forty thousand words now in use in the dialects of England, and not in use in the language. The words of English proper do not number forty thousand, for technical terms and the most recent additions to the language are not, phonetically speaking, truly English. They are not yet under the phonetic regimen of our tongue. Here, then, is another English speech of almost equal etymological extent surrounding the literary tongue and pressing up into its society. These dialects, taken together, cover the whole range of English phonesis, and express it with more strength. Those who speak these rude vernaculars learn the book-language, and

*If it should be claimed that the theory of barbarian wealth in a narrow phonesis is not established, we should fall back upon the fact, chiefly operative in modern life, but equally applicable to dialects intermingling at any period, that a foreign word requires more vocal effort than a native word. This is solid ground.

bring to its expression the energy which the dialects require of their voices. The influence of their example extends to others, and gradually to all, and dialect words from time to time enter the book-English and reinforce its sounds.

It is probably true that the uneducated classes speak with more force over a smaller range of sounds than the educated classes. In other words, that a dialectic phonesis will always prevail among those who know little or nothing of books. If this be true, then we shall see how the non-reading classes do for us in this country what the dialects do for the English—counteract in some degree the decay of our pronunciation.

It is not meant that such a countervailing force is equal to the destructive force. Probably all the opposing forces do not match the destructive in our American-English. If they did so the decay would be unobserved.

But this is not the only barrier put up in this country against phonetic lapse. English is here subjected to a greater external pressure than in England. All the languages of the civilized world are imported by their speakers, and brought into living contact with the English. Dutch, German, and French have from the first contested the ground with the language of the Pilgrim Fathers, and in some sections they have taken a place in the etymology. Portions of New York are covered by Dutch influences, and a class of true dialect words arise out of this fact. In portions of Pennsylvania German has been long spoken with similar consequences. The German spoken there does not perhaps act sensibly upon English etymology, but it does act on English phonesis. In Louisiana and other parts of the Union, and in Canada, French has been spoken longer than English, and it influences both etymology and orthoëpy.* These cases would once have been local, and would have produced no marked effect on the rest of the country; but in our day rapid and incessant intercommunication spreads them over the entire land.

The Indian dialects have doubtless done more for us than we know. The earliest periods of our history were marked by considerable intercourse between the savage and his invading oppressor. The names taken from the aborigines were at first sounded in imitation of them, and to this day they lay an un-

* Add African dialects in the Southern States.

wonted tax on our vocal organs. Old inhabitants of Chicago expend more exertion upon that name than do their children.

We have thus far referred only to languages which have been in the country from the first, and of fruits of these early struggles between them and our language; but the emigration of Germans, Frenchmen, Italians, Celts, Spaniards, Russians, Poles, Turks, and Chinese must be affecting the phonesis at this moment to an extent which we cannot hope to measure. The total phonesis of the race seems represented in these languages, which, brought to our shores by foreigners, are spoken by them for a generation or two side by side in the same mouths, and in curious intermixture of etymology and phonesis with English. If, then, dialectic regeneration acts feebly with us, foreign regeneration—if an awkward term be allowed—exercises a much greater force than dialects usually do.

Even in England this foreign element is very strong. The different branches of Celts contribute each a quota of phonetic force. The Scotch Highlanders, the Welsh, the Manksmen, the Irish, bring into English pronunciation the energy and breadth of their own mother dialects. But this is not all; London is more picturesque in the nationalities of its people than New York. To representatives of all the peoples who come to us she adds natives of her antipodal possessions—Hindoo doctors and Australian peasants. But we not only receive immigrants representing all other countries, we travel and learn the speech of other nations, and in our own mouths reverse the process of our new citizens to produce the same result. And this last fact must be taken into account as acting in every direction and upon all tongues. In an early age two tribes having four consonants each, by uniting, doubled their phonetic wealth. In our age cultivated tongues, by interchange, make common stock of the phonesis of mankind.

Commerce and literary enterprise stimulate men to learn the languages of each other, and the number of persons who can speak two or three is perhaps doubled every year. There is, in every country, a set of men who speculate upon the probable triumph of their own tongue over all others. They usually know nothing of philology, and little of any other than their own tongues; but it is worth while to notice what effects do actually follow the rapid intercommunication of peoples. It is

not the extension of the territory of one speech so much as the enrichment of the vocabularies of all, and the less apparent, but not less certain, enrichment of the phonesis of all. And in this interchange it is the free traders who will triumph. The language which borrows most, which most rapidly absorbs the linguistic wealth of its neighbors, will most nearly realize the dream of a universal language. The tongue which refuses to part with its gold for foreign goods because it believes the gold of more value than the goods will not profit by the commerce of language, or extend the boundaries of its empire.* English has ever been a voracious consumer of foreign vocables. If it continued to devour the speech of every people it might, if it did not burst in the effort, become universal by swallowing all others. This much is certain, that for a long period to come the incessant action of foreign phonesis upon ours will help repair the ruin made by those decaying forces which are eating out the heart of our sound-system.

The influence of classical study and classically-derived nomenclature upon our phonesis ought not to be omitted. The first invigorates the phonesis of all scholars, and indirectly affects all speakers. The second is even more powerful. The number of persons who are interested in these studies is large, and the words given them to speak are numerous and sufficiently difficult of utterance.

Some readers may furnish an unconscious support for this argument by inquiring whether, after all, it is not the prerogative of a higher civilization with a vast literature to dispense with a full phonetic system. One might reason that only the arts of oratory and poetry are strictly dependent upon orthoëpy, and that these are already sickly, and probably destined to pass away with the diffusion of books and their culture. What orator can compete with a newspaper, and what promise is there of a crop of poets? But such speculations, though ever so plausibly supported, depart so far from the plain world in which we live, and imply such an immense advance along the whole line of civilization, that it is hardly safe to found optimist hopes upon them.

Our spoken English is the theater of a great conflict, in

* French translates foreign names when this can conveniently be done.

which it has already lost orthoëpical wealth. Whether these losses are the beginning of wide-spread ruin, the first steps toward a national dialect, and thereby to a new written tongue, and the loss of the treasures contained in the classic speech, depends upon the relative strength of the destructive agencies and those reinforcements of the regenerating army which have entered the field too recently to have tested their prowess.

Art. IV.—ORIENTAL INFLUENCE ON WESTERN THOUGHT AND CIVILIZATION.

At the earliest historical period the inhabitants of Europe known as the Indo-Germanic races give striking indications of their Asiatic origin. According to Professor Max Müller a large number of their etymological roots exist almost identically in the Sanscrit, and there are remarkable affinities of grammatical forms and inflections which are inexplicable but upon the theory of a common origin. Later in the historical period we discover palpable proofs of Asiatic migration. Time after time have vast hordes of nomads from the great central plateau of Asia precipitated themselves upon the plains of Europe, leaving numerous evidences of Eastern origin in the languages, physical appearance, and national characteristics of their descendants.

But we design here to refer more especially to the intellectual influences exerted by Oriental philosophy and science upon European thought. The position of the Attic peninsula, almost on the frontier between Europe and Asia, its intimate relations with the East, and the receptive character of the Hellenic mind, caused Greek philosophy to be deeply imbued with the spirit of Orientalism. The Greek traditions all refer to the East as the fountain-head of all knowledge. Athens was itself an Egyptian colony. From Phœnicia Cadmus brought those primitive characters which are the elements of all European literature. Thales derived the germs of his philosophy from Egypt, whose religious creed in turn was deeply tinctured with the older Hindoo thought. The Indian doctrine of metempsychosis in the teachings of Pythagoras betrays the

source of his leading tenets. The Eleatic philosophy, with its superadded theories of emanation from the deity and final absorption into his essence, presents a still greater resemblance to the dreamy pantheism of India. The Greek intellect seized with avidity the subtleties of Eastern thought, which will be found to pervade not only the ideal philosophy of Plato, but the keener dialectics of Aristotle.

The Persian campaign of Alexander was fraught with very important consequences to the intellectual history of the world. Not the least of these was the founding of the city of Alexandria upon the breaking up of his empire, and its subsequent influence on the civilization and literature of Europe. That influence has hardly been excelled even by that of Athens itself. It made an impression on the intellectual career of the West so powerful and enduring that we feel its results to this day. In the dynasty of the Ptolemies literature and science found a patronage more munificent than that of Pericles, of Lorenzo il Magnifico, or of Louis le Grand. Never had learning such a comprehensive organization and such vast endowments as in the Museum of Alexandria. Neither the French or Florentine Academies, nor the Royal Societies or Universities of Europe, so fostered it. It became the university of the world. At one time fourteen thousand students thronged its halls, and its library contained seven hundred thousand books and scrolls.

The glorious achievements of the Alexandrian school in physical science anticipated many of the discoveries of modern times. The geometrical demonstrations with which Euclid delighted the acute Alexandrian mind two thousand years ago are studied to-day in all the schools of Europe. The Mechanical Construction of the Heavens of Ptolemy, no mean prototype of the Principia, calculates the size of the earth from a measurement of a degree on the shores of the Red Sea. Although much of the Alexandrian learning perished during the darkness and confusion of the Middle Ages, yet much was preserved by the Arabs, and became the germ of modern science. The magnitude and importance of the boon conferred upon the Hellenistic races by the Septuagint translation of the Scriptures confer an imperishable renown upon the name of Ptolemy Philadelphus, at whose command it was undertaken. How remarkable that providence which delivered all the East into the

hands of the Greeks, that their language, the most copious and flexible ever spoken, might become almost universally understood, and be thus the fitting vehicle for the diffusion of the knowledge of the true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent!

The progressive conquest of the Greek monarchies by the Roman power was still another step of preparation toward that momentous event which was to mold the destinies of all future time. At this juncture a new element was introduced into society, which was destined

> "To leaven with its fiery leaven
> All the hearts of men forever."

"Every-where," to use the fine image of Kingsley, "the mangled limbs of the old world were seething in the Medea's chaldron, to come forth whole and young and strong." The old faiths were fading out of the firmament of human thought, before the rising of the Sun of Righteousness, as the stars of midnight vanish at the dawn of day. The old gods reeled upon their thrones, and, like Dagon before the ark, fell before a mightier than they;

> "They feel from Judah's land
> The dreaded Infant's hand;
> The rays of Bethlehem blind their dusky eyes."

The oracles were stricken dumb, their shrines became deserted, Pythia staggered on her tripod,

> "And Dodona's oak swang lonely
> Henceforth to the tempest only."

But the purity of the Christian faith became speedily corrupted. The effects of Oriental influence were seen in the numerous heresies that infected the Church in the early Christian centuries. Alexandria, especially, became a very alembic for the fermentation of thought. Neo-Platonism, that hybrid between Christianity and Paganism, tried to refine away the grossness of the ancient superstitions into a beautiful *mythus*—a sublime inner meaning—in harmony with the doctrines of Christianity. Christianity itself became strongly imbued with this allegorizing spirit. Origenism and Mysticism marred the symmetry and corrupted the simplicity of the primitive faith. Even the acute mind of Augustine, and through him Latin Christianity, was much affected by this visionary philosophy.

These antagonistic principles thus introduced into the Church —this putting the new wine of Christianity into the old bottles of Heathen philosophy—produced the usual result. The fermentation and mutual repression of these antipathetic elements rent the Church into a thousand factions, schisms, and theosophisms. Excommunications, fanatical recriminations, hurtling anathemas, and cries of maranatha filled the air.

It was a presbyter of Alexandria that originated the terrible Arian controversy which for so many centuries rent the Church and deluged the earth with blood. It spread rapidly to the West, and was warmly espoused by the Gothic races. The mutual persecutions of the opposing factions were most virulent. Witness the sneer of Gibbon concerning "the furious contests, which the difference of a single diphthong excited between the *Homoousians* and the *Homoiousians*."

In the East, too, arose the pernicious system of monachism, which has exerted such a powerful influence on Western society. The practice was common to the Chinese Boodhist, the Indian fakir, the Persian dervish, and the Egyptian eremite. The generic idea among all these is the Manichæan doctrine of the impurity of the flesh, derived in turn from the still older notion of the antagonistic principles of good and evil—Ormuzd and Ahriman. The Essenes among the Jews and the Therapeutæ of Egypt presented the leading features of the conventual order of later days. The hermits of Mesopotamia grazed naked on all fours, and the deserts of Syria and Egypt swarmed with monks long before they were known in Europe. Those lonely anchorites

> "Beneath Engedi's palms
> Pacing the Dead Sea beach,"

or seemingly spawned from the mud of the Nile, like the ancient plague of frogs, are all the offspring of the theosophico-ascetic spirit which pervaded the entire East. Monachism was transplanted from the East to Europe in the fourth century, and soon no lonely isle, no desert shore, no gloomy vale, was without its laura or monastery. Differences of climate and of race, however, greatly modified its features, the Western monk never exhibiting the delirious fanaticism which characterized the Eastern confraternities.

The great political and religious convulsion of which the East became the theater in the seventh century exercised a most powerful influence on the arts, literature and civilization of the West. One of the strangest phenomena in history is the rapid spread of that gloomy fanaticism, which in a single century extended its baleful shadow from Bokhara to Cordova, from the Indus to the Loire. Its fierce and fiery energy swept away the corrupt Christianity of the East, save some lingering remnants in the secluded Nestorian valleys, in the Armenian monasteries, and among the mountains of Abyssinia. The schools of Alexandria were scattered, its library destroyed, its glory extinguished. But ere yet the early flush and vigor of conquest passed away the Saracens applied their eager energies to the cultivation of learning. It is their greatest glory that they overran the domains of science as rapidly as the territories of the earth. They soon became heirs of the learning of Alexandria. They eagerly adopted the philosophical method of Aristotle. They swept the monasteries of the Levant and the Ægean for the writings of the Grecian sages. From the Arabic translations of these much of the literature and science of Europe is derived. An intense national life and preternatural vigor was developed. Their active commerce from Alexandria and Cyprus civilized the maritime state of Europe.

But the rapid expansion of the caliphate exhausted the native population and led to political divisions. Hence its glory was but transient. It contained the germs of its own dissolution, and these soon began to develop. It was like some gorgeous flower, which rapidly expands, soon ripens, and as swiftly fades; or like the fair and fragile maidens of the East, who reach a splendid though precocious maturity, but soon become faded and withered.

But it was in Spain that the Saracenic influence was most permanent and most potent on European thought. Sweeping like a tornado over northern Africa on their fiery desert barbs, the cloud of Mussulman cavalry paused but briefly at the straits of Gades, and planted the crescent on European soil, there to wage deadly conflict with the cross for eight long centuries. Filling the land like an army of locusts, they found slight barriers in the Pyrenees, but swarmed across their rugged heights, till the fertile plains of France, from the Garonne to the Rhone, became subject to the sway of the Caliphs.

It was an hour of most eminent peril to Europe. Its future destiny was in the balance. It was the crisis of fate for the entire West. Would the conquering tide roll on and overwhelm the nascent nationalities that were every-where struggling into life, or was the period of its ebb at hand? Should European cities bristle with a grove of minarets or with a forest of spires? Should the superstitions of the mufti and the Saracenic mosque supplant the worship of Christ beneath cathedral dome? Should the son of Abdallah or the Son of Mary receive the homage of the West? Should we to-day—for the destinies of the New as well as of the Old World were involved—be wearing the fez or turban and praying toward Mecca, or be Christian freemen? These were some of the questions depending apparently upon the issues of the hour.

The Moors meanwhile press on. They overspread the plains of Burgundy and Aquitaine, and pitch their tents on the banks of the Loire. They are already half-way from Gibraltar, to the North of Scotland, to the Baltic, and to the confines of Russia. But the fiat had gone forth from the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of the universe: Hitherto shall thou come and no further! Then, broken like the waters and scattered like the spray, that wave of invasion recoiled from the shock of the Christian chivalry, and ebbed away forever from the fields of *la belle France*. Europe was safe! Charles Martel and the peers and paladins of France smote the infidels as with a hammer of destruction.

Thus checked in mid-career, and their fiery strength exhausted, the Saracens settled down behind the Pyrenean wall. Here they won laurels far more glorious than those of war. In the cultivation of literature, art, and science they led the van of Western nations. When Arabian civilization was at the zenith of its glory in Spain, the rest of Europe, except a small area around Rome and Constantinople, was in a condition of barbarism. While the Frankish Kings traveled in state in a rude cart drawn by oxen, the Saracen Emirs rode through their fair and flourishing provinces on prancing Andalusian chargers richly caparisoned with housings of Cordova leather, with golden stirrups and jeweled bridle, amid the clash of silver cymbals, and with flashing scimetars of the famed Toledo steel. While the European serf wore hose of straw and jer-

kins of ill-tanned hide, the Arab peasant was clothed with garments of linen, cotton, or woolen, and the nobles in damask stuffs and silks. London and Paris were mere congeries of wretched wooden structures, penetrated by narrow, crooked, dark and miry lanes, seven hundred years after Cordova and Toledo abounded in well-paved and lighted streets and bazars, adorned with noble marble edifices, mosques, baths, colleges, and fountains. While the strongholds of the European sovereigns were little better than stables—unglazed, bare-walled, and rush-strewn—the lieutenants of the Caliphs held their divans in palaces of oriental magnificence, with mosaic floors and ceilings fretted with gold, with shady alcoves and stately colonnades, where painted glass softened the light, Moorish music lulled the senses, musky odors filled the chambers, and fairy fountains cast up their silver spray; where caleducts in the walls cooled the air, and hypocausts under ground warmed the waters of the bath. Exquisite arabesques, ivory couches, graceful cabinets of sandal or citron inlaid with mother-of-pearl, softest carpets, richest silks, gold, silver, malachite, porcelain, alabaster, miracles of the loom and needle, filigree, and jewelry, attested the Sybaritic luxury of the inhabitants. Yet the lord of all this splendor confessed to have enjoyed only fourteen happy days in his life!

While a great part of Europe was a pathless forest or morass where roamed the wild boar and wild ox, upon the fertile *vegas* of Granada and Cordova waved the yellow corn and flashed the golden orange and citron. There, too, gleamed the snowy bolls of the cotton-plant, and glistened the silky plumage of the sugar-cane. The jasmine bowers and rose gardens of Shiraz seemed transplanted to the fairy courts and colonnades of the Alhambra. While the ignorant European peasant fled in sickness to the nearest relic shrine, or had recourse to the mumbling rites of a superstitious monk, the Moor found in the public hospitals the best scientific treatment of the age. Although the followers of the False Prophet they honored the unity of God, and looked with aversion on the saint and relic worship of the races north of the Pyrenees. An enlightened jurisprudence held the place of the wager of battle and ordeal by fire, which obtained throughout the rest of Europe. They defended their polygamic institution by patriarchal prec-

edent, and contrasted it with the sinful concubinage or unnatural celibacy of the Monastic orders. They were munificent in public charities, and their toleration of the religions of their Roman Catholic subjects and of the Jews was ill-requited by the bloody persecutions and expatriation of themselves and their Hebrew fellow-sufferers by the Catholic sovereigns of Spain.

The revenue of the Moors was greater than that of any kingdom in Europe. They anticipated by four hundred years the maritime enterprise of Venice and Genoa. A fleet of a thousand ships moored in the harbors of Barcelona, Malaga, and the Mediteranean ports. They had factories on the Tanais and the Euxine. They traded with Constantinople, Cyprus, Alexandria, and, overland, with India and China. Of their learning we can only judge by the relics which have survived the fierce wars of the peninsula. The Spanish crusade against the Moors was also a war against science, literature, and art. Spain drained herself of her life-blood by the expulsion of the Moriscoes. When the Christian literature of Europe was shallow and absurd, consisting of lying lives of the saints or disquisitions on the "Light of Tabor," the Moors translated and zealously studied the philosophy and science of the Greeks. Though much of their learning has been lost because Europe was incapable of retaining it, yet much has been preserved to the present day. But even these scattered fragments give evidence of a glorious body of literary and scientific knowledge. Four hundred years before Galileo, when all Europe believed the earth to be a vast plain, Almamon asserted its sphericity, and determined its size from the admeasurement of a degree on its surface. Alhazen anticipated Newton by five hundred years in the discovery of many of the laws of light. It was the Moors who originated scientific chemistry and first applied it to medicine. They laid all Europe under obligation by their achievements in mechanics, horology, astronomy, botany, and zoology, and by their additions to the *materia medica* and the useful fruits and vegetables. They wrote their names forever in characters of light upon the midnight heavens in the names they gave the starry constellations, and left their impress on every language of Europe in the nomenclature of the chemical and other products they discovered. Many

French, German, and Italian ecclesiastics were educated at the Moorish Universities. One of these, Gerbert, afterward Pope Sylvester, introduced the Arabic numerals, the greatest instrument of science, originally derived from India, into Europe. The manufacture of gunpowder, the use of artillery, many of the nobler kinds of metallurgy, were also brought from the East and communicated to Europe by the Moors.

A great and permanent impetus was given to the civilization of the West by that vast movement of the Middle Ages, whereby, in the words of the Byzantine Princess, Anna Comnena, all Europe was precipitated on Asia. The Crusades have been so often treated in detail that we shall only notice a few of their more striking results. These religious wars united the nations of the West in a grand political league long before any similar union could otherwise have taken place. They also greatly improved, or, indeed, almost created, the military organization of Europe, and inspired and fostered the spirit of chivalry in her populations. They led to the abolition of serfdom by the substitution of martial service instead of the abject vassalage to which the masses had been accustomed. By enforcing the so-called Truce of God they prevented the pernicious practice of private warfare, and turned the arms of Christendom against its common foe. Vast multitudes were led to visit Italy, Constantinople, and the East—the seats of ancient learning, and the scenes of splendid opulence. Extended travel enlarged their knowledge of the geography, literature, natural history, and productions of foreign lands. In the East still lingered the remains of the science of the palmy days of the Caliphate. The rustic manners of the Crusaders became polished by their contact with the more refined oriental races. To the British or German knight, who had never stirred farther from his ancestral castle than a boar hunt or a stag chase led him, what a wonder-land must Italy and the East have been, with their great cities, their marble palaces, porphyry pillars, and jasper domes! The Crusaders, becoming acquainted with the luxuries of the Orient, discovered new wants, felt new desires, and brought home a knowledge of arts and elegances before unknown.

The result was seen in the greater splendor of the Western courts, in their more gorgeous pomp and ceremonial, and in

the more refined taste in pleasure, dress, and ornaments. The miracles and treasures of ancient art and architecture in Greece and Italy, far more numerous then than now, did much to create and develop a taste for the beautiful, and to enlarge the sphere of human enjoyment. The refining influence of the East and South have left their mark in every corner of Europe, from Gibraltar to Norway, from Ireland to Hungary, from the crosses on the doors to the arabesque traceries in cathedrals and castles.

It is not wonderful that these great and stirring events, with their combined religious enthusiasm and military splendor, awoke the imagination of the poets. They gave a new impulse to thought, and a greater depth and strength to feeling. They inspired the muse of Tasso and many a lesser bard, and supplied the theme of the great Christian epic, *Gierusalemme Liberata.*

The Crusaders, moreover, made several commercial settlements in the East, the trade of which survived their military occupation by the Latins. Thus a valuable commerce sprang up, which contributed greatly to enrich the resources, ameliorate the manners, and increase the comforts of the West.

But there were grave and serious evils resulting from the Crusades, which went far to counterbalance all these advantages. The lives and labors of millions were lost to Europe, and buried beneath the sands of Syria. Many noble families became extinguished by the fortunes of war, or impoverished by the sale or mortgaging of their estates to furnish the means for military equipment. The influence of the Pope, as the organizer of the Crusades and common father of Christendom, was greatly augmented. The opulence and corruption of the religious orders was increased by the reversion to their possession of many estates whose heirs had perished in the field. Vast numbers of oriental relics, many of them spurious and absurd, became objects of idolatrous worship. Many corruptions of the Greek Church were imitated, many Syrian and Greek saints introduced into the calendar, and many Eastern legends and superstitions acquired currency.

Of most important bearing on the literary history of Europe was the fall of Constantinople, A. D. 1453. Terrific and protracted was the struggle for the key of Eastern empire and the

throne of the Eastern Cæsars. The toils of Fate at length encompassed the doomed city. The cup of her iniquity was full. The wrath of heaven, long invoked by her horrid abominations, at length burst in flame upon her head. The fierce and fiery Mohammed, like an avenging messenger of doom—an awful Nemesis—appeared before her walls. Never was more dreadful night than the eve of the final assault. The blaze of nocturnal fires illumined the entire extent of massy wall. The novel terror of the lightning flash and thunder stroke of the newly-invented cannon—terrific to the Greeks as the bolts of Jove—were added to the more familiar concussions of the battering-rams; while the mysterious and inextinguishable Greek fire heightened the horror of the scene. Above the din of conflict were heard the shouts of the terrible Janissaries—eager for the slaughter as hounds in leash—*Allah Akbar! Allah hu!* while within the doomed city arose, amid the darkness, from the sad procession of priests and warriors wending to the Church of St. Sophia, the wailing dirge, *Kyrie eleeson! Christe eleeson!*

All Europe was aghast with horror and dismay at the fall of the ancient seat of Greek empire. The Pope summoned the entire West, from Sweden to Naples, from Poland to Britain to drive the Turk from European soil. But spiritual anathemas and political leagues were alike despised by the victorious invader. He crossed to Italy, seized and sacked Otranto, and would probably have become master of old as well as of New Rome had he not been overtaken by Death, a conqueror as relentless as himself.

The Byzantine capital was the great treasure-house of ancient learning. There the Greek language—the language of Homer and the gods—was a living tongue. That tongue, corrupted by the populace, it is true, was spoken by the nobles with sufficient purity to enable them to delight in the sublime dreams of Plato, the dark tragedy of Æschylus, or the Christian eloquence of Chrysostom. The victorious army of the Turks compelled the flight of the Muses. A vast number of educated Greeks emigrated to Italy, and were dispersed throughout the entire West. The immense collection of MSS., statues, antiques, gems, vases, *intaglios*, and treasures of art and objects of luxury was scattered throughout Europe. Florence became a

haven for the exiled Greeks. Cosmo de Medicis and his illustrious descendant, Lorenzo il Magnifico, became the zealous patrons of the new learning. Thus the ancient literature, which withered and was forgotten under its native skies, revived and flourished in a western clime.

Simultaneously with the fall of Constantinople, the invention of a German mechanic gave wings to the new learning, wherewith it might fly, as lightly as the thistle-down, to the ends of the earth. This wonderful art gave a permanent life to that ancient literature which was in such imminent danger of extinction, and, by the immense multiplication of copies, made it thenceforth indestructible. By this revival and diffusion of Greek learning, also, a mighty impetus was given to the great Reformation, which was soon to emancipate the minds of millions, and to stimulate the process of free inquiry wherever Protestantism should prevail.

Another very powerful Oriental influence exerted upon Europe was that of the Jewish race. That race, though everywhere proscribed and persecuted, every-where obtained a footing, and, by the advancement of science and commerce, repaid with benefits the injuries it received. Yet the tale of their persecution by fire and faggot, by rack and dungeon, is one of the darkest pages in European history. Pillaged and plundered, scattered and peeled, branded and mutilated, smitten by every hand and execrated by every lip, they seemed to bear, in all its bitterness of woe, the terrible curse invoked by their fathers, "His blood—the blood of the Innocent One—be upon us and on our children." Trampled and beaten to the earth, decimated and slaughtered, they have yet, like the trodden grass that ranker grows, increased and multiplied in spite of their opposition. Those "Ishmaels and Hagars of mankind," exiled from the home of their fathers, and harried from land to land, have verily eaten the unleavened bread and bitter herbs of bondage, and drunken the waters of Marah. In many foreign lands they have sat beside strange streams and wept as they remembered Zion.

> "Anathema Maranatha! was the cry
> That rang from town to town, from street to street;
> At every gate the accursed Mordecai
> Was mocked and jeered and spurned by Christian feet."

But that toleration which they found nowhere among the

disciples of the Galilean, they received from the followers of the False Prophet. They were advanced to the highest positions of trust and honor at the courts of the Saracen conquerors of Spain. They became the treasurers and confidential advisers of the Emirs. They were frequently the chancellors and professors of the Moorish universities. They were generally the favorite physicians of the rulers, an office not less influential than that of the confessors of the catholic sovereigns of Europe.

There was, indeed, a mutual bond of sympathy between the children of Ishmael and those of Isaac. Besides their common descent from the Father of the faithful, and their kindred languages, customs, and traditions, their similar creeds concerning the unity of the Godhead, and their aversion to the Trinitarian theology of the Christians, drew them more closely together. In Alexandria the Jews had acquired all the learning of the East. Indeed, it was from them and the Nestorians, doubtless, that the Saracens acquired those germs of science and philosophy which they afterward developed to such munificent results, alike on the banks of the Euphrates and of the Guadalquivir. Thus a mighty but intangible influence accompanied their invasion of Europe that the iron hammer of Charles Martel could not beat back. Great numbers of Jews came to Spain with the Saracens. They became the first and, for a long time, almost the only physicians of Europe. They enriched the *materia medica* with discoveries of chemistry, in which they were expert. The healing art was previously obscured and debased by magic, sorcery, and empiricism. These hags of darkness, to use the figure of Professor Draper, vanished at the crowing of the Æsculapian cock, announcing that the intellectual dawn of Europe had arrived. The system of supernaturalism, which universally obtained, was first assailed by the practical science of the Jews. Their rationalistic diagnosis relieved disease of its spiritual terrors, and sapped the foundation of superstition in Europe, as Christian science is at present doing in India. This, and their great wealth, made them the frequent victims of the Inquisition. Notwithstanding, some of them became the private physicians even of the Popes who persecuted their race. They taught in the Rabbinical schools of Italy, Sicily, and France, as well as in Spain. Persecution and travel sharpened their naturally acute intellects, so that

they early got control of the greater part of the commerce of Europe. It has been truly said, They were our factors and bankers before we knew how to read. The Spanish religious wars drove many from that country and dispersed them through Europe, to which they gave an intellectual impulse which it feels to this day.

Jewish influence also contributed to mediæval thought a tinge of Oriental mysticism. The turbid stream of cabalistic philosophy intoxicated some of the noblest minds of Europe. The wild and fantastic theories of Paracelsus and the Rosicrucians, of Cornelius Agrippa and Jacob Behmen, concerning the various orders of elementary spirits, emanations from the deity—a mixture of fanaticism and imposture—were also founded upon the reveries of the cabala. That theophanic system, in its turn, was linked with the venerable Oriental lore of ancient sages on the banks of the Ganges and the Oxus.

The influence of Hebrew thought and of the Eastern imagery and language of the Sacred Scriptures upon the Christian system of theology opens up a vast and varied field of investigation which we must leave to some abler pen than ours. It might be found that many of our common and controlling thoughts have their roots far back in remote Oriental antiquity. Assuredly it would appear that the Syrian faith, which began first to be preached at Jerusalem, has been more potent in its influence on the heart and mind of Christendom than all the lore of Greece or Rome, or than all the combined wisdom of the Orient and Occident besides. It has been the great seminal principle from which has sprung all that is best in all the literatures and philosophies, in all the systems of ethics and jurisprudence, in all the political and social economies of the world since its promulgation. It has ennobled, dignified, and elevated them all. It is the hope, and the only hope, for the regeneration of the race.

Much might be said, had we space, upon the influence of the commerce of the East—the land of pearl and gold, of spices and perfumes, of frankincense and myrrh—on the civilization of Europe. The maritime States of the Mediterranean became especially enriched thereby. The names of their merchant princes became familiar as household words in the bazars of Damascus and Ispahan. Their daughters were clothed with

the silks of Iran and the shawls of Cashmere; and in their *boudoirs* hung, in gilded cages, the tuneful bulbul from the gardens of Schiraz. In the effort to prosecute this gainful commerce by a shorter route a new world was discovered, where the problem of humanity is now being wrought out to such glorious results. The wealth of Ormuz and of Ind was poured into the lap of Europe. Her comforts and luxuries were increased, her manners refined, her enterprise quickened, and a field of empire opened to her arms.

The present decrepitude of the Ottoman Empire can give no idea of its strength in the fiery zeal of its youth, nor of the apprehensions which it caused throughout the West. A new crusade was then waged, not to wrest the Holy Sepulcher from the power of the Turks, but to prevent the subversion of the Christian faith in its very strongholds. Their corsair fleets swept the Mediterranean, and the terrible Janissaries were the scourge of Central Europe.

For two hundred years the tide of battle ebbed and flowed across the great Sarmatian plain, between Vienna and Belgrade; and Germany became in the sixteenth century, as Spain had been in the eighth, the bulwark of Christendom.

It is strange that the power which was long the standing menace of other nations of Europe should now exist only by the sufferance or jealousy of those very nations. Yet feeble and decrepit as is Turkey, no country excites such regard. The interest thickens around the "sick man's" couch. He holds the key of empire in his trembling grasp. Into whose hands shall it pass when it falls from his? This is *the* question of the day—the Gordian knot, whose intricacy, indissoluble by any diplomatic skill, may, possibly, yield only to the keen edge of the sword.

In the East itself, under Ottoman rule, a blight seems to rest upon the fairest and most favored lands on earth. The glory of the Seven Churches of Asia has departed; the candlesticks are removed out of their places, and thick darkness has settled upon the land. The beautiful myths of Homer and the sublime Gospel of Christ are alike forgotten, and the Turkish mosque has superseded both Pagan fane and Christian temple. As we contemplate these things we cannot help asking, Is it forever? Is there no resurrection for those

nations? no regeneration for those lands? Yet, though oppression and superstition may have crushed and degraded the inhabitants, nature is eternal, and the golden sunlight falls, and the sapphire seas expand, and the purple mountains rise as fair and lovely as of yore. The valleys of the Orontes and Jordan and the slopes of Lebanon are no less beautiful, nor is the soil of Egypt less fertile to-day than in the time of their greatest prosperity and glory.

The Christian nations of the West are called upon by every principle of moral obligation and of human sympathy to reciprocate the benefits they originally received from the East. It is theirs to carry to those dark lands the light of the Gospel, and the blessings of letters and civilization. Indications of the progress of Western ideas are already numerous and striking. The iron horse snorts in the valley of the Nile, and the iron steamer plies upon its sacred waters. The recent visit of the Sultan and his Viceroy to the seats of western civilization must have impressed them with the contrast between its vigor and prosperity, and the effete and worn-out condition of society in their own dominions. May we not hope that they will be convinced of the superiority of Christian institutions and of monogamic marriage to the superstitions of the mufti and the debasing sensuality of the seraglio? The recent Abyssinian expedition has carried the prestige of European arms and science, and will probably open a way for the Gospel into the very heart of Africa; and the opening of the Suez Canal makes Egypt the high-way of the Western nations to the East. Christian schools and Christian missions are sowing throughout the entire East the seeds of new and nobler civilization. The crescent may ere long give place to the banner of the cross upon the battlements of Zion, the long-rejected Messiah be adored amid the scenes of his passion, and Jerusalem become again a praise in the earth.

The drowsy nations of the remoter East are turning in their troubled sleep. They are arousing themselves from the lethargy of centuries, and are shaking from them the incubus which so long has oppressed them—their fatuous scorn and hatred of the western barbarians. They are waking up to the activities of the age. They feel the pulses of a new life throbbing and thrilling through all the veins and arteries of

society. The light of science and of the Gospel is dispelling the clouds of ignorance, superstition, and prejudice that so long have mantled over those lands. The night of ages is giving way, and its darkness is being dispersed. A brighter day is bursting on the East. Its freshness breathes around us now. The heralds of the dawn may every-where be seen. Old and hoary symptoms of idolatry and priestcraft are crumbling away. Cruel and bloody heathen rites are being exterminated. A vigorous journalism—that great disseminator of the seeds of thought—is springing up in all the great marts of commerce both in India and China. The absurd myths of the gods, and the religious cosmogonies, are yielding to scientific criticism. The sacred Ganges and the Hoogly swarm with vessels impelled by a more potent genius than any of the Arabian Nights—the great western magician—Steam. China is constructing a steam navy. Yokohama is being lighted with gas. British and American commerce are extending the sphere of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, and diffusing liberal ideas. Chinese emigrants are swarming to Australia and the Pacific coast of America, and insensibly imbibing much of the western spirit and enterprise. The Pacific Railway conducts the tide of oriental commerce to the very heart of occidental civilization; and the projected Pacific Telegraph Cable will knit together East and West in indissoluble bonds of "peace and good-will."

The glorious trophies of the progress of civilization are the auguries of still grander triumphs in the future. Those already mentioned are of very recent achievement. What sublime results may not some who read this brief retrospect behold! Those blind and impotent old lands, which so long have struggled with the demons of superstition and idolatry, shall eventually sit, clothed and in their right mind, at the feet of Jesus. The day is hastening when, in a world saved, regenerated, disenthralled from the power and dominion of sin, the Redeemer shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; when he shall receive the heathen for his inheritance, the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; when upon all the industries and activities of the world—upon all its trade and commerce, its art, its science, and its literature—shall be written, HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

And to this blessed consummation all the events of history,

the rise and progress of nations, the decay and fall of dynasties, are tending. With devout as well as philosophic eye, let us read the history of the world, and endeavor to discern, amid its confused revolutions, its battle and its tumults, the great moving principle—the wheel within the wheel—God by his providence reconciling the world unto himself. Let us ever feel that

> "God's greatness flows around our incompleteness,
> Round our restlessness his rest."

Art. V.—THE ETHICS OF LATIN COMEDY.

It is doubtful whether the moral notions of a people are best represented in the ethical systems of her philosophers. These systems are not constructed on the basis of popular sentiment. They may embody that sentiment in part, but they are often only the speculations of a profound thinker whose theories and ideas are not always even the metaphysics of practical morality. Doubtless the current of popular ideas will mingle more or less in the flood of philosophical thought, and give it more or less coloring; but the little streams will disappear in the larger flood. The ethical sentiment of the masses, that which governs their every-day life, is fused into new and unrecognizable forms in the crucible of the philosopher. The public morals of our own age are not so well mirrored in the ethical treatises and text-books, the essays and homilies and theological dogmatics of our thinkers and professional teachers, as in the lighter literature of the day and the regular issues of the periodical press. A poet from the people, a novelist from the masses, steeped in the ideas and manners of the nation at large, is the best portrayer of actual morality. Burns unvails the Scottish heart better than Chalmers. Shakspeare and Dickens and Scott utter the real practical moral sentiment of England better than Barrow or Hall. Victor Hugo illustrates the popular ethics of France better than Guizot. The more closely literature photographs real life the nearer is our view of the genuine heart-beats, where actual conduct is the exponent of controlling ethical principles. The best index of a man's faith is his life. The ribs and frame-work of a nation's faith reveal themselves most distinctly when the

toga of philosophy with its deceptive folds is taken off, and only the working tunic with its close-fitting honesty remains.

The same law is true for all time. A day of actual observation in the Rome of the Christian era would tell more of her moral state than the whole history of her gods. To stand for an hour in the forum, to lounge at evening on the thoroughfares of business, to watch the comers and goers of the thermæ in the waiting rooms of those splendid structures, to sit amid the throngs of the amphitheaters, to listen to the conversation in the atria of the dwellings and in the shops of the artisans, to mingle, in a word, with the current of that surging Roman life, would daguerreotype at a glance more than the philosophic pencil could paint in a life-time. It is upon similar principles that Aristophanes is a better representative of Athenian morals than Plato; that Plautus teaches popular ethics better than Cicero.

Comedy is a style of literature admirably adapted to develop the real state of public morals. It is not embarrassed by the necessity of conforming to an ethical system. This requires an unfolding of all its details in harmony with a basis that may be partly ideal, partly in advance of general practice or at variance with it. Comedy is not thus trammeled. It affords a fair field where the spontaneous heart of the people may appear. It is from the people and for the people. If its characters are true to life, they must speak the colloquial language and utter the current sentiment of the people. They will enunciate its maxims, adages, and proverbs, which are the best index of a nation's moral consciousness because they are the practical rules of common life. They are the decalogue of its law and the beatitudes of its gospel.

Comedy is a fine setting for ethics. Its groundwork does not lie in the moral faculties. Its legitimate purpose is as far from moral teaching as laughter is from tears. Its moral sentiments, therefore, sparkle like stars through the cloud-rifts. They are the sudden uncovering of the heart and conscience, the faith and the religious nature, in the midst of the general sweep of mirth and hilarity. They are the big boulders in the roaring torrent, that tell of solidity at the bottom.

To Plautus, Terence, and Cæcilius we must look for these practical illustrations of religion and piety among the ancient

Romans. Scattered through their works there is ample material for constructing their systems of ethics and theology. I shall give only a few specimens, chiefly from Plautus, showing the prevailing notions of the age. Fundamental in their practical conduct would be their ideas of the Deity and his attributes. What these ideas were may be seen from two or three quotations:

> There is a God, and he whate'er we do
> Sees with omniscient eye and hears it too.
> As thou for me, so he for him will care;
> The well-deserving good, the evil ill must share.
>
> *Capt.*, Act II, sc. 2, lines 313–316.

> Throughout the nations, each his errand given,
> Great Jove, who governs earth and highest heaven,
> Dispatches us, his ministers, to know
> The deeds of men: what piety they show,
> What character they bear, what faith they keep;
> That each due meed of actions here may reap.
> Who by false witness gets unlawful gain,
> By wicked oath another's dues retain,
> Their evil names and crimes of deepest dye
> Are borne by us and registered on high.
> Who by base perjury obtain their cause,
> Or bribe the judge to override the laws,
> His righteous judgment doth the case reverse,
> And plague the guilty with the heavier curse.
> The good on separate tablets are enrolled,
> Their honored names in characters of gold.
> And yet bad men imagine in their thought
> With gifts and blood Heaven's favor can be bought,
> Nor know that while they pray at heavy cost,
> Their gifts and sacrifice are labor lost.
> The pious suppliant sooner far will find
> Grace from above than he of evil mind.
> Be glad, ye good, and in your works rejoice,
> Who faith and piety have made your choice.
>
> RUDENS, *Prol.* 9–30.

These extracts contain as excellent religious sentiments as are to be found in classical literature. They recognize a Supreme Being, and the infinite attributes of power, knowledge, and justice that belong to him. The eternal principles on which the Divine Being metes out rewards and punishments according to the different characters of men are correctly stated and commended. Whence came their ideas of a *record* of human transactions? Can they be traced through the traditions of centuries back to the Old Testament Scriptures? Had their

ancestors long ages before heard the voice of God and echoed it thus distinctly down to them? Had they ever heard the words of the Psalmist, "Shall they escape by iniquity? Put thou my tears into thy bottle: are they not written in thy book?" Had they read, "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me?" Had they heard of Solomon's grand basis of judgment, "whether it be good or whether it be evil?" If the idea of a future judgment was not contemplated, for what purpose was this registering of good and bad deeds? How closely the sentiment of these passages agrees with the voice of inspiration in regard to the true principles of worship is most strikingly shown by a comparison with verses tenth to thirtieth of the first chapter of Isaiah.

As a parallel to these quotations from Plautus it will be of interest to read the celebrated passage from Menander, of which it has been remarked that it contains almost all the precepts in the second table of the Decalogue:

> The man who sacrifices, Pamphilus,
> A multitude of bulls, or goats, or sheep,
> Or prepares golden vestments, purple raiment,
> Figures of ivory, or precious gems,
> Thinking to render God propitious to him,
> Most grossly errs, and bears an empty mind.
> Let him be good and charitable rather;
> No doer of uncleanliness, no corrupter
> Of virgin innocence, no murderer, robber
> In quest of gain. Covet not, Pamphilus,
> Even a needleful of thread; for God,
> Who's always near thee, always sees thy deeds.—COLMAN.

With such a recognition of spiritual attributes in the Divine Being as these passages afford, it seems hardly possible that the foundation of ethical consciousness in the soul of Plautus and Menander, and those whom they represent, is an impersonal natural or an embodied material being. The eye that reads the secrets of all hearts, the presence that environs every human being, and the power that controls all human conduct and worldly events, must belong to an infinite Spiritual Being. The lack of formal and systematic statements is no deviation from the method of all the earliest writers whether inspired or uninspired. The clear recognition of truth in writings where the establishment of that truth is not aimed at, as in axioms, proverbs, poetry and history, is free from all suspicion of

logical sophistry and all the doubtfulness of counterfeit philosophy.

It is the virgin gold of the sands, with no touch of artificial gilding. One cannot read such language without feelings of moral sympathy. It is the spiritual pulse of humanity that throbs through the ages. It is not that conviction is produced, but conviction is already there, and the slumbering elements of the Divine within us feel and bear it on as the magnetic reservoirs of earth receive and transmit any exciting influence. The quickness of the response indicates that, however buried in the rubbish of ignorance or false education, the soul leaps to hear the voice of the Infinite Father whenever he speaks.

This longing of the heart after the Divine Being, as the proper foundation of religious life, is laid hold of by Paul in his discourse on Mars Hill. His assertion and quotation from Aratus, the Cilician poet, "For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring," has its counterpart in the prayer of Hanno in the Pœnulus of Plautus.

> O thou who man dost nourish and defend,
> By whom we live, on whom our hopes depend,
> Make this day fortunate for my design;
> My children lost, for whom long years I pine,
> Restore to liberty, that I may see
> Unconquered piety is blessed of thee.
>
> *Pœnulus*, Act IV, sce. 4, lines 14–17.

The clearest acknowledgment is given in these lines of man's indebtedness to the Deity for existence, support and success, and an unwavering confidence that the rewards of virtue, though long delayed, are sure. Through them we may see, as Paul saw of the Greeks, Him whom the Romans of the Plautinian age ignorantly worshiped. They breathe the same inward yearning of the soul after the true and living God which Paul interprets as really meant for him in the ignorant and blind worship they offered, and which he endeavors to guide by the faint light that reveals the higher world to a profounder knowledge.

God has not left himself without a witness. As he has written some of his attributes upon the material world, so he has written others upon the human heart. To the natural sense, physical law is evident by experience and observation. To the moral sense, moral law and the fundamental facts of

moral relationship and duties are evident, not by the slow processes of reasoning and inference, but by the constitution of the moral nature. In prehistoric and prephilosophic ages morality was a practical art, and not a speculative science. Even the Old Testament writers are not philosophers. They enter into no discussion, inquiry, nor speculative dispute. They appeal simply to memory, conscience, and sentiment for facts, precepts, and motive. The uninspired authors of the same age, while they give all the essential principles of virtue and the motives to its practice, give us no regular treatises on morals. They simply give the voice of conscience with no sophistry to stifle it. The gods of Homer and Hesiod are no creations of a philosophic brain, but they are the gods whom the people worshiped. The poets simply recognized them as they found them. The notions that the laws of justice had divine authority, that there was a future life in which virtue was rewarded and vice punished, that there is a Providence that interests itself in the affairs of men, and that men are responsible to God, were universally prevalent. On these principles, needing no more demonstration than the axioms of mathematics, but taken for granted as known and admitted by every body, each individual, with the simplicity and certainty of intuition, felt rather than inferred certain other consequences, and constructed all the practical rules of life. Realizing no need to prove the existence of God, they said he was to be reverenced and worshiped. It was not necessary to establish his authority and rights, but it was necessary to obey him. They made no inquiry into the nature of conscience, but they heeded its dictates. They needed no discussion in regard to justice and injustice in order to save them from confounding them. Not disputing the question of the soul's immortality or immateriality, of a future state, or of the nature of rewards and punishments, they feared a Being who abhors wickedness, and practiced virtue in expectation of his blessing.

The gleams of these fundamental truths that flash out in the ancient poets, and especially in comedy, are refreshing, not only as the revelation of God, written upon the fleshly tablets of the heart, but as a relief to the general mass of corruption both in literature and in the society it portrays. They are the flowers upon the sepulcher. Amid the seething volcanic fires that

raged in the social life of heathendom, they tell of a restless moral Enceladus whose uneasy rebellion at his confinement fitly symbolizes the conscientious remonstrances with which God shakes men, though they heap crime upon crime to mountain proportions. God never takes the sting from conscience. The testimony to its power is no uncommon sentiment in the ancient writers. Cicero often alludes to it. Ovid thus recognizes it:

> Clean innocence in woe much comfort hath;
> As is the conscience, so the mind doth breed,
> Or hope or fear, for every acted deed.—MASSEY.
>
> OVID, *Fast.*, Lib. I, ver. 481.

So Horace, Lib. I, Epist. I, ver. 60:

> Be this thy brazen bulwark of defense,
> Still to preserve thy conscious innocence,
> Nor e'er turn pale with guilt.—FRANCIS.

In the Mostelleria of Plautus, Tranio utters the same sentiment:

> Nothing so wretched to the writhing heart
> As guilty conscience with its venomed dart.
>
> *Most.*, Act III, ver. 12.

Some miscellaneous quotations will indicate in various social and civil relations the correctness of moral sentiment which the Romans entertained, and its striking similarity in many instances to that of Scripture. Philto, in the Trinummus, Act II, sc. 2, line 28, speaks thus:

> If passion rule the man he is undone;
> Self-hood is lost, and servitude begun;
> But whoso his own spirit ruleth, fame
> Victor of victors justly shall proclaim.

One would almost accuse him of plagiarism on the proverb of the wisest of men: "He that ruleth his own spirit is better than he that taketh a city." How accurately is Paul's doctrine of unselfishness and humility echoed in these lines:

> That man is upright who does not repent
> His uprightness, and secretly lament,
> Who pleases self does not deserve to wear
> So high a title, nor its honors bear;
> Who thinks but meanly of himself doth show
> The nature only noble souls can know.
>
> *Trin.*, Act II, sc. 2, line 40.

What could be more in harmony with the first commandment with promise than the filial reverence of Lysiteles?

My father! upward from my earliest youth
Thy precepts have I kept with filial truth;
Though noble born and free I bow my will,
And deem it just thy wishes to fulfill.

The Psalmist says of the good man, "With long life will I satisfy him;" and of deceitful men, they "shall not live out half their days." Young Pleusicles echoes it, Miles Glor., Act III, sc. 1, line 135, thus:

Justly the gods apportion human life;
Who nobly bear them in this earthly strife
Long years they give; but reprobate
And wicked men quick leave their mortal state.

Alcmena's catalogue of the virtues which a moral wife should possess, and which she claims for herself, if universally practiced might improve even a Christian society in these days of divorce and murder:

Not mine the dower which sordid souls require;
But womanly reserve, subdued desire,
Untarnished honor, reverential fear
Of God, and love for friends and kindred dear:
To you obedience, gifts to all the good,
And help to those who have in virtue stood.

Amph., Act II, sc. 2, line 210.

In connection with this passage, the soliloquy of Adelphasium in the Pœn., I, 2, 1, indicates that the peculiar weakness of the sex is not wholly a modern development:

Who wants employment, all his hands can do,
A woman and a ship procure—these two:
For no two things more business can entail
When you begin to rig them to set sail.
Ne'er enough rigged are these to suit their taste:
Insatiate two! reckless of loss and waste.

The gross corruption of social life, so fearfully pictured in inspired and uninspired history, was not without those who condemned it and warned man against it. There was a spirit of conservatism, and a longing for the more ancient virtues. The social surface was a boiling Acheron, from which ever and anon a wail of lamentation and of warning came forth. Thus Philto's advice to his son:

I know the wicked manners of our times,
How evil men the good seduce to crimes;
How greed and lust turns sacred to profane,
And public interest yields to private gain.

Disorder reigns! men thirst for fame and power,
And gape for gain as earth for cooling shower,
For this I weep; this breeds tormenting care;
Of this, I urge thee day and night, beware.

Trin., II, 2, 8.

Could a history of morals among all nations and in all ages be written, it would constantly reveal a broad gulf between theoretical and practical virtue. No matter whether the foundations of virtue be in the religion of nature, in the philosophical systems of classical antiquity, or in the Christianity of the Bible, the same inconsistencies between sentiment and action would be found. Every-where the heart preaches virtue and the hand practices vice. To this universal law the morality of pre-philosophical and mythological eras furnishes no exception. Had the ethical theories as to the true basis of a prosperous civil government, branded upon the popular conscience as they were, been embodied in the popular conduct, imperial Rome would never have existed nor republican Rome been conquered.

Be but the manners of the people good,
The city's fortified with noble blood;
If breach of faith be banished from her walls,
If public money heed no private calls,
If avarice, scandal, perjury and spite,
Ambition, idleness, the lawless might
Of lust, injustice: these be driven hence,
The thickest wall is not so sure defense.

Persa., IV, 4, 10.

What other morality is necessary to the perpetuity of a state? Had it been incarnate in the Roman people, the historian of the "Decline and Fall" would have been without a subject.

Some promiscuous sentiments and proverbs, selected from the multitude, that contain ethical elements, will be of interest as showing the current of opinion that prevailed, as well as some correspondences between the past and the present:

He dies to live who dies in virtue's cause.—*Capt.*, III, 5, 33.

'Tis in the nature of unhappy men
To envy good and give their betters pain.—*Capt.*, III, 4, 50.

This is the modern adage, "Misery loves company."

A favor done to the good is pregnant with good.—*Capt.*, II, 2, 103.

An evil known is best; an ill unknown
Puzzles all knowledge what had best be done.—*Trin.*, I, 2, 25.

A wise man makes his fortune for himself.—*Trin.* II, 2, 84.

In every thing the golden mean is best.—*Pœn.*, I, 2, 98.

"I wish you well" is but a hollow term,
Save of good services it form the germ.—*Trin.*, II, 4, 38.

That you conceal it from your wife, be sure;
To keep a secret she cannot endure.—*Trin.*, III, 3, 70.

Wisdom is gained by effort, not by age.—*Trin.*, II, 2, 88.

'Tis best to be the best in every aim;
Below the second best ne'er rest thy claim.—*Trin.*, II, 4, 86.

The man who does not know his way to sea,
'Tis fit the river his companion be.—*Pœn.*, III, 3, 15.

Old age is a sad peddler, on his back
Bearing along of grievances a pack.—*Mœn.*, IV, 5, 5.

The hammer is no wiser than the handle.—*Epid.*, III, 4, 100.

He's a friend indeed
Who proves himself a real friend in need.—*Epid.*, I, 2, 15.

If a woman's handsome she is dressed enough.—*Most.*, I, 3, 180.

'Tis not easy
To blow and swallow at the selfsame time.—*Most.*, III, 2, 103.

Never speak ill of absent friend!—*Trin.*, IV, 2, 82.

The bell never tinkles of itself.—*Trin.*, IV, 2, 160.

As servants choose to have their master be,
Good to the good, bad to the bad is he.—*Most.*, IV, 1. 14.

Bad men are so because they hate the good;
One must himself be good the good to love.—*Pseu.*, I, 1, 16.

O a good temper's half in half in evils.—*Pseu.*, I, 5, 38.

Count it as lost whate'er you loan a friend;
If sought again, he's hostile in the end.

With this compare the sentiment of Shakspeare in Hamlet, Act I, sc. 6:

> "Neither a borrower nor a lender be,
> For loan oft loseth both itself and friend."

The common saying, "Blessings brighten as they take their flight," may have originated in the mournful lament of Ergasilus for his patron:

When men once lose the good that they possess,
They prize what erst they held as valueless.—*Capt.*, I, 2, 40.

And Shakspeare may have read it and put it into the friar's mouth when he said:

For so it falls out
That what we have we prize not to the worth
Whilst we enjoy it: but being lacked and lost,

Why then we rack the value; then we find
The virtue that possession would not show us
Whilst it was ours.—*Much Ado about Nothing*, Act IV, sc. 2.

So, also, Shakspeare's oft-quoted "Thrice armed is he who hath his quarrel just," is paralleled in Alcmena's indignant remonstrance to Amphitrus:

Bold may she be who's free from all offense
To plead her cause with mailèd confidence.—*Amph.*, II, 2, 206.

The soul of honor in an honest breast
Is to remember duty's high behest.—*Trin.*, III, 2, 70.

'Tis worthy of the gods to have respect
Unto the poor.—*Trin.*, IV, 1, 10.

Oft what we have in hand and plain to view
We count as lost, and seek, and seek anew.—*Trin.*, IV, 2, 69.

Sorrow keeps close behind pleasure.—*Amph.*, II, 2, 5.

Patience is the best sauce for sorrow.—*Rud.*, II, 3, 72.

"*Tunica proprior palliost*," "My coat is nearer to me than my cloak;" "*At nemo solus satis sapit*," "Two heads are better than one"—these are sentiments which find some proverbial mold among all nations.

With one other passage showing the common ideas and feelings of humanity we close these quotations:

Him we call wise whose counsel hath success,
And him a fool whom fortune fails to bless.
Ourselves are fools when what we wish to have
Importunate the boon we willful crave:
As if 'twere possible for us to know
What will turn out to our advantage. So
We lose the certain and the uncertain keep
In toil and pain till death upon us creep.—*Pseud.*, II, 3, 15.

When the noble sentiment of Terence, "*Homo sum, nihil humanum a me alienum puto*," was first uttered on the Roman stage, it was received by the whole audience with a burst of applause. Through the harness joints of their corrupt armor it pierced to their moral vitality. Below Roman sensuality and selfishness, below the black lava-tide of corruption that covered the Eternal City more terribly than the fires of Vesuvius had burned Pompeii and Herculaneum, slumbered still the life of God in the human soul, imprisoned and crushed, but responsive to truth and virtue, and ever asserting itself.

Art. VI.—WUTTKE ON GREEK ETHICS IN THEIR GOLDEN AGE.

Translated by Professor J. P. Lacroix.

It was in the Golden Age of Attic philosophy, and especially in the efforts of Plato and Aristotle, that Gentile thought put forth its proudest efforts by wisdom to find out God. The views of these two thinkers deserve, therefore, special study.

Plato: General Principles.

Plato gives to Greek ethics a broad basis and scientific form. The world is an objective expression of divine ideas—a thing of beauty. Whatever corresponds to the divine idea, whatever is Godlike, is good. Man's final cause is, by virtue of his rational spirituality, consciously and freely to realize the good. The essence of virtue is delight in the good as being truly beautiful; that is, it is love. Virtue, as being in itself harmony of soul, is also the condition of true happiness. It is not, however, the mere sensation of pleasure, but rational knowledge that is the criterion of the good. Virtue, therefore, is neither indifferent to pleasure, nor consists in it, but produces it. Nevertheless all virtue, because of the imperfection essentially clinging to actual existence, remains ever incomplete in the earthly life; the corporeal state itself of man is a hinderance to the truly good.

Virtue is essentially an indivisible whole, but because of its relation to manifold spiritual faculties and activities it presents itself under the four forms of wisdom, manliness, temperance, and justice; of which the first is fundamental and controls the others.

Morality, however, is not an isolated quality of the individual; it is fully realized only in the moral community, the State; and the State, instead of being based on the family and on moral association, is rather itself the all-inclusive form of moral sociality. It produces out of itself and dominates with unlimited authority both the family and all other social bonds. The absolutism of the State swallows up into itself every right of the individual and of the family; and it is not as man, or as a member of the family, but only as citizen, that the individual

is capable of true morality. But it is only a small minority who are capable of citizenship; and this gifted few are, by the very fact of their capability, called to the unlimited guidance of the majority. The moral calling is, therefore, not for man in general, nor is it for all the same, nor is it in its full scope possible for all.

Basis and Nature of Virtue.

Plato far surpassed Socrates in spiritual insight. His creative genius developed the thoughts which his master had seen but in the distance into profound theories widely differing from the popular moralizing of Socrates. His unsystematized ethical thoughts lie profusely strewn through his works, Protagoras, Laches, Charmides, Euthyphron, Gorgias, Menon, Philebus, Politicus, and especially in the work wherein he shows the practical application of his ethical views, The State.

In taking a deeper hold than had yet been done on the thought of the rational spirit, Plato gains a much firmer basis for the ethical than any previous philosopher. The world, though not created, is yet molded by God, the absolute rational spirit, and is the truest possible expression of his thoughts, a copy of the divine eternal ideas. The realization of an idea is the beautiful; the *cosmos* is therefore a thing of beauty. The rational undying spirit of man is called to realize the beautiful, the ideal; and the highest goal of human life is ideality, that is, it is to become like God. This Godlikeness, consisting in justness and intelligent piety, is the good, and the highest good is God himself. But Plato does not further develop this thought of Godlikeness, and, indeed, he could not, as the idea itself of God, from his heathen stand-point, was too indefinite. The idea of good is not derived from the idea of God, but contrarily the idea of God from the idea of the good, as being fundamental and *per se* certain. The Platonic and the Christian idea of Godlikeness are widely different. In the place of the notion of a divine command we have that of the idea of the good, innate in the reason itself. This is the only conceivable revelation of the divine will. The good, which is conceived rather indefinitely as the inner harmony and order, or beauty, of the soul, that is, as the completed domination of the reason over the lower appetites—a formal rather than a

material definition—is *per se* divine and real, and as such is to be sought after. Virtue of itself renders truly happy, that is, produces inner soul-harmony; and there is no happiness without virtue, for virtue itself is harmony, or beauty, of soul. To do wrong is the greatest of all evils, greater than to suffer wrong. But happiness is not identical with every transitory feeling of pleasure. Such a feeling, being dependent on outward circumstances and mental moods, cannot, like the idea of the good, be unconditionally known, hence it cannot be a criterion of the good, nor can the good be sought after merely because of its pleasure.

The knowledge of the idea of *the good* being, like the consciousness of any other idea, not a product of reflective thought but an immediate possession of the reason, and the highest form of knowledge, is the basis and condition of virtue. Virtue is not a natural quality of man, but must be learned, and by learning be appropriated. The knowledge of the good leads necessarily to the cultivation of what is recognized as good. Evil springs essentially from error, and is never consciously and designedly committed. In this, Plato is perfectly in harmony with Socrates. The will has no independence in the face of knowledge, but is merely its necessary expression. The sensual desires, it is true, can oppose reason, but the spiritual will cannot. But that the heart, the spiritual essence itself of man, can have a natural propension to evil, Plato has no conception. And yet we find in him an obscure consciousness of the disorder of the actual world in the fact that he regards the present imprisonment of the soul in a body not as its original and natural condition but as a penal state. In fact, according to Plato, the soul existed as a rational personality in a previous bodiless state, and was imprisoned in a trammeling body only because of a moral transgression, so that now it is, as it were, fettered in a dark cell or cave. Also for another reason, though the good is the highest goal, yet is it never fully attainable in the earthly life. For as the actual world is not exclusively the work of the absolute Divine will, but is a product of two factors, of which the one is the primitive, unreal, (μὴ ὄν,) formless matter, and the other the ideal Divine will, and as this undivine matter does not perfectly yield to the will of God in stamping his ideas upon it, even as wax does not perfectly reproduce all the fine feat-

ures of a seal, so is the world not absolutely perfect, but only the best possible one. It is not the pure expression of the rational spirit, but there clings to it a never-to-be-overcome substratum of irrationality: an evil lying in the essence itself of the world, which, while not originating in the transgression of moral beings, is yet the ground-spring of all moral evil—an original sin. So, also, there is in man himself an original and never, in this life, entirely-overcomable disagreement between reason and the lower animal appetites, which should, in fact, be controlled by reason. Hence, with Plato, the moral consciousness lacks that hopeful confidence which characterizes it in the Christian system. "Evil can never be overcome, for there must ever be something opposed to the good; it cannot have hold among the gods, but dwells in mortal nature; hence, man must strive as speedily as possible to flee hence." "True philosophers desire to strive after nothing else than to die and be departed; for so long as we have the body, and our soul is joined to this evil, we cannot attain that whereafter we long." And they refrain from laying upon themselves suicidal hands only because God has placed them in this life as upon a watch which should not be rashly abandoned.

Morality consists, therefore, principally in man's turning himself *to* the ideal or spiritual, and *from* the merely sensuous. But this is only the ideal side of morality; the other is the real. As God, impressing his ideas upon matter, shaped the world into an object of beauty, so must also man actively work on nature, transforming it into beauty. Virtuousness is, consequently, active pleasure in the beautiful, which itself is harmony, not merely physical but also spiritual. The essence of virtue, or this pleasure in the beautiful, is love, *eros*, a thought fondly dwelt upon by Plato. But this love is widely different from Christian love, whereby man in communion with God feels himself in spiritual union with his fellow; but it is a love for the appearance, for the beautiful. Not the divine *per se* is loved, but only its concrete and essentially sensuous manifestation. It is not a love of soul for soul, but one that clings to the sensuous form. Hence, in Plato's State, it has no significance for the family. It is true, *eros* rises from the sensuous to the spiritual, to soul-beauty; but the sensuous remains the *basis, and does not derive its worth from the spiritual.* The beautiful

under all its forms is *per se* a relation of the Divine; is, in fact, the only phase of the Divine which we know. This is the characteristically Greek stand-point: beauty and grace cover every sin; even the frivolous is recognized as good, provided only it is beautiful. The approval of love under *every* form, even that of unnatural lust, is so familiar to the Greek that, to the shame of Greek morality, even Plato seeks philosophically to justify it. The predominant trait of love here is not self-denial, as with the Christian, but rather pleasure. I love another not for his sake but for mine. Love knows no sacrificing suffering, but only a rejoicing; at most a suffering of longing or jealousy. It is true, a merely sensual, fleshly love is censured; but wherever there is a higher love, not simply for the body but also for the soul, and where the Divine is recognized in the beautiful, there sensual love, even under the form of a defilement of its own sex, finds its justification and becomes a virtue, nay, a religious enthusiasm. "Esthetically done it is beautiful, but otherwise shameful." The simple circumstance that Plato speaks so often, so lengthily, and with such manifest fondness of this absolutely vicious love, (Rom. i, 27,) while he hardly mentions mere sexual love, and in his extended discourses on *eros*, says not one word of conjugal love, and yet attempts by the strangest sophistry and enthusiastic poetizing to drive away a lingering suspicion that this unnatural vice is, after all, infamous, is an astonishing evidence of the moral darkness of the Greek mind.

The Four Platonic Virtues.

Plato's development of the idea of the ethical is as follows: Virtue is of one-fold nature, and appears primarily under the form of wisdom, *σοφία*, that is, a knowledge of the true and good. But in that wisdom discovers to the consciousness what in the moral life is really to be feared, and what not, it assumes a special form, and gives rise to the virtue of manliness or courage, *ανδρεία*. In that it teaches wherein the inner harmony of the soul consists, and how to hold the passions in subjection to reason, it assumes the form of temperance, *σωφροσύνη*. In that it properly orders the inner soul-harmony in its active relations to others, claiming its own rights and conceding the rights of others, it appears as justness. Thus the three virtues, manliness,

temperance, and justness, are the three phases of the one cardinal virtue, wisdom. Justness is made to include piety or holiness, by which man preserves a proper attitude toward the gods.

A fuller development of the virtues is not given. The reason of the particular four which are described rests rather in the wants of the State than of the individual. A special treatise on duties is superfluous, as in Plato's opinion the harmonious soul is of itself able to find the right in each particular conjuncture.

The Platonic State.

It is a noteworthy advance of the ethical consciousness that morality is here conceived of not as belonging to the mere individual, but as finding its full expression in the *community*. But this thought is developed with such passionate theorizing one-sidedness that, in his ideal State, Plato has produced what appears in the eyes of practical reflection as a mere satirical caricature, and brought upon himself the charge of utterly impracticable Utopianism. It has been sought to save his reputation by holding that he never intended his State for realization. But both the charge and this apology are equally unjust to Plato. His "State" is plainly his most mature and favorite work. There is not the least evidence that his ideal was not intended for realization; there is, on the contrary, much evidence that he made repeated attempts, and had strong hopes of seeing it put into practice by Dionysius the Younger in Syracuse. Moreover, he himself teaches its applicableness in practice.

The State of Plato is diverse enough from modern ideas; but to Greeks, especially those who favored Doric politics, it was by no means so novel, and, in fact, it had been partially realized in the laws of Sparta. The Platonic State is especially instructive in its contrasts to the Christian ideas of the community, the Church, and the State. Let us notice them.

According to Plato it is not the individual, but the State, that is the properly moral person; and by the State all morality of the individual is conditioned and produced. Moral individuals do not make the State, but the State makes them. Without and apart from the State there is no proper morality, but only barbarism. The object of the State is, hence, to make of the citizens morally good men.

The State is a simple moral organism corresponding to the three forms of the soul-life. In its teaching, defending, and victualing functions it represents reason, courage, and sensuousness in the three classes, the wise, and therefore ruling ones, the warriors, and the producers. It realizes inward harmony, and hence justness and happiness, by assuming the reins of the arbitrary individual will and assigning and forcing upon each the precise sphere of his activity. There must be strict separation of classes, the rulers allotting to each his rank. The special virtue of the producers is temperance or modesty. Those of both the warriors and rulers are bravery and wisdom. The rulers and warriors are gold and silver; the producers are but ignoble brass. This class is not to meddle with politics, but only with trade and agriculture. Slavery is a matter of course, though, when possible, only non-Greeks should be enslaved.

Of the rulers the essential trait is wisdom. There can never be many acting rulers; it is best when there is only one, and he a philosopher. The good of the whole requires the unlimited dominion of the best—aristocracy or monarchy. As wisdom can find the best step in every case, the power of the rulers should not be hampered by many statutes. The wise regent will often, without law and against the will of individuals, realize the good of the State, and compel the citizens to allow themselves to be made happy.

A truly free personality is consequently ascribed only to the wise ruling ones; all others are, in the whole scope of their life, absolutely subject to the State. If some liberty is allowed to the third class, it is only out of contempt: "though cobblers are bad, it does not endanger the State." But the truly wise and manly citizen is in absolute tutelage to the State. The two upper classes, as the chief factors of the State, are by the State both reared, educated, and in their whole activity directed. Music and gymnastics, as tending to harmony, are the main elements in education. The rulers cannot enter on their functions before the age of fifty. Their training requires the additional sciences of mathematics and philosophy. Any other religious training than that given by philosophy Plato could not commend, as he well knew the worthlessness of the popular religion.

The all-embracing, all-determining State has all and unconditioned rights; the individual has rights only so far as the State concedes them. Even to his own life he has no right when the State can no longer profit by him. Physicians must let the incurably sick perish without help. The State alone may possess; individual property should not be allowed. The artisan class labors not for itself but for the State; by which regulation Plato hoped to have excluded all cause of social strife. Even poetry is subject to a strict censorship. The drama is utterly prohibited. The State prescribes the meters in which alone verse may be written, and of musical instruments allows only the lyre and the cithara.

The Platonic Family.

The family is not the foundation, but only a subordinate phase of the State. Personality has in it no rights. The person of one consort belongs not to the other, but to the State. Wedlock proper is hence not allowable. The citizen should beget children in the interest of the State, and his stimulus should not be love of the sex, but civic duty. The citizen may not select the wife who temporarily is allowed him; but the State gives her to him, ostensibly by lot, but, in fact, the rulers should "make use of falsehood and deception" in artfully controlling the lot so as always to bring about the most suitable matches. Men may beget between the ages of thirty and fifty-five years; women may bear between those of twenty and forty. Permanent marital relations are out of the question; in fact, a change of wives is expressly required. No one may regard his wife as exclusively his own. It is to be a fundamental principle for the free, active citizen, "that all the women shall be common to all the men, that no one should live entirely with another, and that also the children should be in common, the father neither knowing what child is his, nor the child who is its father." Hence children are to be taken from the mother immediately at birth and reared by the State, every precaution being used to prevent the mothers from ever recognizing the children they bore. They are to be suckled by the women in common, and promiscuously. The sickly and crippled are to be let perish. After the lapse of the prescribed age for procreating, the men and the women may have com-

mercе with each other according to elective affinity, save only that births must be prevented, and, where this cannot be done, the children must be starved at birth.

The woman is not the mother of the family, she is a citizen with political duties; and she may even fill governmental offices. They must practice manly trades, and must participate, naked, in the gymnastic exercises. They must even march forth to war, though in battle they are to hold the rear position. For between men and women there is no other difference than that the former beget and the latter bear; the former are stronger, the latter weaker.

Caste.

This family-annulling despotism of the State applies strictly only to the two higher classes, while the producing class is less cared for, and allowed greater liberty. The great problem of all moral social life, namely, to realize the good of the community through the moral freedom of the individual, Plato was unable to solve, save by giving a sweeping plenary authority to the civic organism at the utter sacrifice of all individual self-determination. Objective morality swallows up and precludes all subjective morality. This, however, is not peculiar to Plato: it is the Greek tendency in general. Rather do we find in him a decided advance. While the Spartan system, somewhat like the Chinese, gave remorseless sway to impersonal law, and did away with personal liberty in very essential things; and while in the Athenian democracy the irrational whim of the masses disposed of the fate of the individual, the Platonic system gives the former into the hands of the personal spirit, at least in the person of the philosophically-educated and tried regent. From the stand-point of heathen antiquity, which conceded no right of the individual as against the State, this is a real progress; and what appears to us as unnatural and one-sided in it is owing, not so much to the erroneousness of the step forward, as to the fundamental erroneousness of Greek philosophy in general.

That the Spirit of wisdom and power may and is to be poured out on all flesh, (Joel iii, 1,) that there is no acceptation of persons with God, but all are equally called to be children of the truth, such a thought is utterly unknown to all

antiquity, and hence also to its greatest philosopher. Of an absolute morality binding on all Plato knows nothing. To a Greek, civilization without slavery is inconceivable. The slave is incapable of morality, and even only a small minority of the freemen can practically attain to wisdom. Proclivities toward or against virtue are transmitted physically from parent to children. The ground for this classification of mankind into a rational minority, and an unreasoning passive majority, lies not exclusively in the general consciousness of the Greeks, but also in the peculiar ontological views of Plato himself. The primitive dualism of all being shows itself also in man. As the world is not an absolutely perfect expression of the spirit, and as the rational spirit is not an absolutely omnipotent power, but can only, more or less fully, impress itself on the primitive stubborn chaotic substratum of all actuality, without being able perfectly to dominate and spiritualize it, so also in humanity do the rationally-enlightened few stand over against the unreasoning and relatively unspiritual many, whose destiny it is to be shaped and led by the few.

Ethical Progress.

The real advance of Plato beyond former ethical views consists in the fact that, freeing the idea of *the good* from all dependence on the mere pleasure of the individual, he conceived it as *per se* valid and based in God himself, and, hence, described morality as Godlikeness, as the image of God in man, as, in fact, the very essence of rationality itself, and that, consequently, he regarded the moral life as a harmonious unity growing out of the one principle of wisdom. But by not fully freeing himself from the dualism so characteristic of heathen thought, he rendered it impossible for him to rise to the conception of the entire freedom of God and man, and, in fact, to that of a perfect morality. True personality is recognized neither in its scope and rights, nor in its guilt. There remains in all existence, even in the highest moral life, a stubborn, indelible, spirit-hampering element of primitive chaos, over which God himself is not absolute master. The barrier to perfect morality lies, not in the transgression of the individual, but in this uncongenial primitive element of his and of all other nature. The possibility and duty of morality are differ-

ent for the different classes, but even the freest man is not entirely free. The moral freedom of the philosophers is hampered by their corporeality; that of the free citizens, by the supervision of the rulers; and that of the slaves, by the whole weight of the body politic. And from the might of this hinderance to moral freedom there is no redemption in this world, but only in the future, and through death. Morality bears neither in its realization nor in its perversion an historical character, does not aim at a general shaping of the world's history; and even the ideal State is but a theater for the skill of the individual rulers without an all-embracing cosmopolitan purpose. And the moral consciousness itself hardly rises above an individual character, as its connection with the divine consciousness is but loose and unessential.

But the general gain to ethics through Plato is far from insignificant. Light and order spring out of crude confusion. Ethics is no longer a mass of disjointed maxims, but has come to a partial self-consciousness. But Plato lingers so much in general principles that he hardly comes into detailed contact with every-day life. In these general principles there are, as far as it was possible from a heathen stand-point, some slight approaches toward the Christian consciousness; and there would have been much greater had the philosopher succeeded in severing the chain which held the floating ship still fast to the shores of naturalism—that is, if he could have once freed himself of the notion of a primitive uncreated spirit-clogging matter, and exchanged his μὴ ὄν for an οὐκ ὄν. But this he did not. Aristotle himself could not solve, but only disguise, the unwelcome problem of dualism. But so long as free spirit is not made the basis of being, the true ethical idea is impossible. and moral efforts have no sufficient motive.

While, on the one hand, the recognition of a hampering limit to the moral life may seem to be an approach to the Christian idea of general depravity, on the other it is a wider departure from the same; for this limit is not placed in moral guilt, that is, in the sphere of freedom, but in that of a primitive, fatalistic substratum of nature. It did not spring from an historical deed, (the fall,) and hence is not to be removed by an historical deed, (redemption.) The oft-expressed painful consciousness of the moral disorder of the world leads to no

thought of divine intervention. The sage, by wisdom, frees himself from imperfection as far as possible; and he frees others by philosophy and by absolutistic statemanship, but not by a sanctifying, humanitarian, historical breaking into the course of history, as does Christianity.

In his idea of the State there lies a presentiment of the truth that morality is not merely of individual, but also of social character; but from this presentiment he speedily retreats. His State is not a shaping factor in general history. Springing up not out of human society, but out of a philosophic brain, it continues to exist for the benefit of the favored few. Looking to no general reformation of the world, it is an isolated individual existing along side of many others like itself. It may be very small, need not have more than one hundred free citizens. And in this view of the State Plato was self-consistent. He had no thought of making entire humanity an object of moral beneficence, no thought that international peace might be hoped for. On the contrary, war was to him a normal condition of society; Greeks and non-Greeks were by nature enemies. Let this State theory of Plato, which was planned for the most gifted nation of the world, be but compared with the theocratic State of the Old Testament—with its constant world-historical goal, its fundamental purpose of salvation, and therefore of peace and universal brotherhood, and slowly realizing itself in the bosom of an unthoughtful, uncongenial race, and the immense superiority of the latter appears at once.

Religious Defectiveness.

The feeblest side of Plato's ethics is in its religious bearing. To the beautiful thought of Godlikeness he does not hold fast. The making of the ethical depend on God's will was foreign to him, and must have been so, as he had no thought of a revelation of that will. He based it on the rational consciousness of man. But that this consciousness could exist in all men he did not venture to hope. Hence he placed the moral guidance of the masses in the hands of the philosophers, supplying, by the wisdom of these, the lack of a divine revelation. Also his deeply-conceived idea of God he does not develop into its consequences and find in it the basis of the ethical. It is true, he is far from the folly of those modern theories which make

morality independent of piety; for he makes piety an essential element of all moral living, and derives, even from the divine judgment after death, a mighty motive to the same; still, however, he does not make piety the spring of all the virtues. It is simply one of the virtues, and not even the highest, but only a branch of justness. And he does not venture to base it on his own noble idea of God as unity, but on the *gods* of the popular religion. But as he himself indignantly exposes the immorality of the whole system of Greek mythology, and bitterly censures the sentiments of Homer—nay, for moral reasons, banishes his poems from his ideal State—it is difficult to say how he justifies piety toward the popular gods. This is, in fact, a signal defect in his ethical system as a whole.

Aristotle: General Principles.

Aristotle, the completer of the Platonic, and, in fact, of Greek philosophy in general, though in many respects independent of Plato, was far inferior to him in speculative height of thought. He first reduced ethics to a separate systematic science, related on the one hand to physics and on the other to politics. His reduction of Plato's dualism to the least possible quantum does not lead him to a deriving of the ethical idea from the idea of God, but, on the contrary, to a more confident basing of it on the rational consciousness of men. A healthy psychology gives ethics a solid basis; but the ignoring of the Platonic antagonism of the ideal and the real gives it a morally feebler coloring.

But more in detail. Aristotle gave ethics not only its own name, but, in the main, the form which it retained till toward the close of the Middle Ages. His treatise, in ten books, abounds in striking thoughts and in acute empirical observations; but as a system it has many defects and hiatuses. Few general principles are scientifically developed; much is merely aphoristic. He confessedly does not aim at strict demonstrations, as the subject only admits of probability. Hence his style, in contrast to Plato's poetic loftiness, sinks mostly into dry, popular reflections.

Though not rising to the full conception of a creative God, Aristotle drives still further into the back-ground than Plato the antagonism between God and primitive unconditioned mat-

ter. Though reluctant to admit such antagonism at all, he yet fails to utter the only thought that could free him from it, the thought with which the Bible opens. To him the world is not simply the best possible one; it is the perfect expression of the will of God. Hence he loses sight of Plato's notion of an evil element present in all reality. All reality is good. Corporeality is no longer man's prison; the body is the normal organ of the soul. There has been no historical fall of man. The mass of mankind, it is true, have no natural propension to virtue, being governed by passion and fear; but the better gifted free-born are by nature thoroughly good, and hence have in reason a pure course of ethical knowledge. By virtue of this theory Aristotle finds for himself, in the subjective spirit, a perfectly safe footing; and although he conceives of God as the absolute rational spirit, even more decidedly than Plato, yet he associates the contemplation of nature and mind less closely with the idea of God than did the latter. Viewing the world as more perfectly the expression of God's mind than did Plato, he can more confidently than he interrogate Nature, and trust in her answers as direct, divine truth. He feels, much less than Plato, the need of the supernatural.

Aristotle makes morality spring wholly out of the subject: it is not so much conformity to the Divine Will, as simply the life-course which is demanded by man's own nature. While in Plato there was the partially clear feeling that the moral goal of life consisted in Godlikeness, in pleasing God, and hence was of objective character, in Aristotle it is the subjective element which predominates—the moral goal being the personal well-being of the subject. In Plato the highest and best is transmundane and ideal; in Aristotle all ideal is also real and actual. The present world is morally the perfect expression of God's will. Hence in Aristotle we find no trace of that Platonic longing after something better, and of that painful sentiment that the embodied soul is a bird of Paradise ensnared in the toils of prosaic matter. With him life is no longer tragical. Poetic inspiration gives place to commonplace contentment. But in this satisfaction with the actual world there is far less approach to the Christian view than in Plato's consciousness of an inner antagonism in the universe. Plato's soaring mysticism gives place to an earth-looking rationalism.

The bright feature of Aristotle's ethics is its psychological basis; but the very fact that it is almost exclusively of psychological character, and is rooted neither in religion nor in history, constitutes also its weakness. While Plato so strongly insists on the immortality of the soul, and finds in it a stay for morality, Aristotle throws it doubtingly into the background. Nay, he expressly calls it absurd (*ἄτοπον*) to hold that man is happy only after death. His morality is only for this life. He expressly designates death as the greatest of evils, (*φοβερώτατον ὁ θανάτος,*) "for it is the end of all; and for the deceased there seems to be no longer good or evil."

Nature and Kinds of Virtue.

All rational effort has as its goal a *good*. The highest effort aims at the highest good. This highest good is perfect happiness, consisting, not in quietism, but in the active life of the rational spirit, and therefore in virtue, which, on its part, includes in itself the feeling of happiness. Virtue itself is either rational or ethical, according as it relates to reason or to sensuousness. The former springs from learning, the latter from practicing. As good consists in harmony—that is, in a right proportion—evil consists in an excess or a defect. Hence virtue is the observance of the just mean between two non-virtues, that is, views. The condition of moral action is perfect freedom of will, to which, in opposition to the notion of Socrates that the knowledge of the right leads of necessity to its performance, Aristotle holds fast.

More in detail: It is the nature of rationality to be active, to will. The aim of all willing is a seeming or real good. Of objects aimed at, some are only means to higher goods. But striving, if it be rational, must look to a perfect good, having its end (*τέλος*) in itself. Honor, riches, knowledge, are but means to the supreme good. This good is the perfection of the person, his well-being, (*εὐδαιμονία,*) the power of a life whose end is in itself, (*ζωῆς τέλειας ἐνέργεια.*) This well-being, being more comprehensive than our "happiness," which is only subjective, is both subjective and objective. And it is not an ideal that is to be realized in the future, but it is the actually realized state of every inwardly and outwardly well-conditioned sage. It is not a sum of differ-

ent goods; it is in itself a whole, of which the manifold and lesser goods are but as many phases. It is not simply vegetative or sensuous life, but it is rationally active life. It is not apart from, or a mere result of, virtue, but includes in itself both virtue and its necessary fruit—happiness. It can hence be said that the highest good consists in practicing all virtue; though Aristotle admits that perfect well-being includes more than is directly given by virtue, namely, wealth, honorable descent, beauty, health, etc. But with this admission Aristotle breaks the logic of his system For if there are conditions of the highest good which are independent of personal moral perfection, and which, consequently, the truly virtuous man may lack, then is the moral order of the world imperfect, and virtue has an insufficient motive. In order to attain to the highest good, man is required to seek for objects which are not included in a virtuous life! As Aristotle does not admit the moral depravity of mankind, he is involved here in an insoluble contradiction. But he prefers to be inconsistent rather than, in the interest of his system, deny an evident fact to whose explanation he had no clue.

But wherein now consists virtue? In man there is a twofold life, sensuousness and rationality, which are often in conflict. Sensuousness—appetite, passion—so far as voluntary, should be guided by reason. Virtue has therefore two phases, as related to the supremacy of reason, and to the subordination of sensuousness. In the one case it is thought-virtue; in the other, ethical virtue, (*ἀρετη διανοητική καὶ ἠθικη.*) The former is wisdom; the latter are temperance, liberality, etc. Wisdom is a virtue, as being meritorious and praiseworthy. The term "ethical" is here used in the narrower sense of *practical* usages. Now it is evident that this division of the virtues is inadequate, as there are strictly spiritual virtues, such as humaneness, truthfulness, thankfulness, which have nothing to do with sensuousness, and are yet not intellectual or thought-virtues. And if wisdom be taken in the wide Platonic sense, then are these ethical virtues not co-ordinate, but subordinate, to it.

Intellectual virtues, says Aristotle, can be taught and learned; ethical virtues spring from repetition, are, in fact, habits. By nature we have no virtues, but only a capacity therefor. Virtuous actions are not so much the fruit as the antecedent con-

dition of virtue, and man becomes virtuous only by repeatedly acting virtuously. The difficulty as to how and from what motive a man can act virtuously before he is virtuous, Aristotle admits, but does not solve. Virtue is defined as being not an affection, as love, hatred, fear, nor a capacity, but a developed capacity, a facility of action, a ἕξις, namely, that facility by which man becomes good and does good. But this is a merely formal and unsignifying definition. To give it a substantial meaning Aristotle makes this resort: In every thing there are many wrong ways but only one right, as, for example, in shooting there are many directions for missing the mark, but only one for hitting it. The wrong of an action is either a *too much* or a *too little*; the right is the just mean between the two. A virtue in its full definition is therefore a voluntarily acquired facility in observing the just means, (μεσότης.) The middle course is best in all things. Courage is a virtue holding the mean between cowardice and rashness; temperance, between indulgence and insensibility; liberality, between prodigality and niggardliness, etc.

Defectiveness of the Just-Mean Principle.

It is evident that this merely *quantitative* distinguishing of good and evil mistakes the very essence of morality, and places the criterion of the ethical, not in the conscience, but in the calculating understanding. Good differs from evil not in quality, but in quantity, degree; and the passage from one vice to its opposite leads through that middle point wherein consists the corresponding virtue. Aristotle is conscious of the imperfection of this definition of the ethical, and even admits that there are some moral actions to which the notion of "too much" or "too little" is inapplicable, such as envy, murder, theft, adultery; there being, for example, no just mean in, and no allowable degree of, adultery. And this is as much as to admit that in such cases virtue does differ qualitatively from vice. And if, in spite of this admission, as well as this other one, that the right mean stands sometimes nearer to one of the opposed vices than to the other, he does not abandon his formal definition of virtue, it only shows the great embarrassment of the honest theorist.

Morality presupposes free-will. Passion and sensual temp-

tations do not destroy freedom, but man can and should govern them by reason. The sage aims at what *is* the best; the multitude, at what seems the best. But it does not follow that men sin only from error; for personal consciousness and civil legislation hold an adult responsible for all the evil he does. It is true, the majority go astray only from error in judgment or from perversity of character; but this error and perversity are their own fault, and hence do not excuse them. Man may, even purposely, do what he acknowledges to be evil, mainly in that he aims not at the good, but at the agreeable. The notion that no one consciously does wrong is inconsistent with undeniable experience, and with the idea of a free-will. In this connection, Aristotle makes the surprising observation that he who has made his character evil can no more change it by willing, than he who has made himself diseased can, by willing it, become sound. An evil man can no more turn back in his course than a projected stone can return to the hand that threw it. This thought might have led him further, but he does not pursue it—does not inquire how moral reformation is possible. Moreover, he limits the effects of evil to the individual—knows nothing of its propagation from generation to generation. Every man, at least every free Greek, is by nature good, and has in his reason a perfectly adequate counterbalance to his lower propensities.

The Several Virtues.

Aristotle treats in detail of the ethical virtues first, and in this order: courage, temperance, liberality, magnanimity, equanimity; then of the social virtues: politeness, truthfulness, modesty, justness; and, after these, of the intellectual virtues: prudence and wisdom. From another point of view, namely, the degree of moral power exercised, virtuousness assumes the two forms of simple self-mastery, and of heroic or divine virtue.

Differing from Plato, he does not treat first of wisdom, but of courage or manliness, (*ἀνδρία.*) By it man triumphs over the fear of death, whether in war, on the sea, or in sickness, and not from the hope of an imperishable crown, but simply from pleasure in duty and in the beautiful. As courage preserves the proper mental equipoise in view of evil, pain, etc., so the

second virtue, temperance, (*σωφροσύνη*,) preserves it in regard to sensuous pleasure. By the third virtue, liberality, we give with discretion, and out of pleasure in the beauty of the act, to those who deserve, and especially to public purposes, such as theatrical exhibitions, popular banquets, equipments of ships, etc. Magnanimity, (*μεγαλοψυχία*,) a virtue peculiar to the gifted, observes the mean between vain self-esteem and excessive humility. It is the ethical pride of the great man, in contrast to the becoming bearing of the common man, which is but modesty. Only he is magnanimous whose distinction of descent, possessions, social position and personal virtues enable him to seek and obtain the esteem of the wise and eminent, and to be indifferent to the opinion of the multitude. The virtue of equanimity holds the just mean between irascibility and phlegmatism. The failure, at the fit occasion, to show anger, or to defend one's self, or even to take revenge, is dishonorable and pusillanimous. Indulged revenge stills wrath; but one must not be excessive in it.

Without logical connection, Aristotle now passes to the social virtues. Between the vices of a fawning seeking-for-approbation and an anti-social rudeness stands the virtue of politeness; which is observed not merely toward friends, but toward all. Between boastfulness and ironical self-disparagement stands the just mean of truthfulness, especially in regard to one's self. But as praise of self is more offensive to others than disparagement, it is better to incline rather to the latter. The virtue of social facetiousness preserves the just mean in wit and joking, as opposed to clownishness and sarcasm. Of shamefulness Aristotle speaks briefly; but of its true and moral significance, as indicated in Gen. iii, 7, he has no conception.

The most important social virtue is justness, as relating chiefly to the observance of the rights of property. The rule of the just mean is here of different application, as it is absurd to speak of an excess of justness. Related to justness is the virtue of discreetness, or appropriate action in cases where the letter of the law does not enjoin a specific course. In some cases it declines, out of a sense of justice, a right which the law concedes. Man cannot be unjust toward himself; even suicide is a wrong, not against one's self, but against the State.

To the intellectual virtues, as prudence and wisdom, the rule

of the just mean is plainly inapplicable; they do not preserve the mean, they only discover it. Prudence (φρόνησις) is that spiritual readiness by which, in each accidental conjuncture, we embrace fitting practical courses of action. Wisdom (σοφία) is a higher virtue, dealing not with the contingent, but with the universal, the unchangeable, the ultimate. Prudence and wisdom are not the sole virtues, but they are as ὀρθὸς λόγος, the antecedent condition of the other virtues.

Aristotle now considers the general attendants of moral action, namely, pleasure, (ἡδονή,) and well-being, or happiness, (εὐδαιμονία.) Pleasure does not always coincide with good. Many kinds of pleasure are goods and should be sought; others not. A legitimate pleasure is one which attends a virtuous act. Happiness is not a mere state, but rather it is rational *living*. As learning is the highest form of life, the acquirement of truth coincides with the highest happiness. It resembles the happiness of the gods, which consists not in outward, but in rational activity.

Solidarity.

The idea of solidarity, or community of interest among the members of society, so strongly insisted on by Plato, is still more emphasized by Aristotle, without, however, rising above the Græco-heathen stand-point. The idea of the universal brotherhood of man is wholly wanting. The family is not regarded as the basis of society, but only as one of its phases. Connubial and filial love are but special forms of friendship. Friendship is not so much a duty as a mere outgrowth of our seeking for personal well-being. The community is not based on friendship, but on the sum total of moral laws which make up the State. The object of the State is to be an instrument through which the wise may hold in check and habituate to good the great mass of the morally immature.

To friendship Aristotle devotes two whole books of his Ethics. Friendship is not so much a single virtue as a special phase of virtue in general. It includes love, but does not coincide with the idea of Christian love. It is not objective and universal, but subjective and individual. It loves, not so much for the sake of the loved one, as for that of the lover. It extends not to mankind at large; such a duty was never dreamed of by a

Greek. It is true, friendship seeks the good of its object, but not primarily and directly. Friendship makes the friend ours in a certain sense, and we love *ours* in him. It loves only in proportion as its object is of worth to it. Self-sacrificing maternal love Aristotle observes, but does not comprehend.

He speaks but briefly of wedlock and sexual love. Marriage is the most natural of friendships. It looks not merely to offspring, but also to mutual aid and culture in the whole sphere of life. It is man's to protect and be faithful to the wife, and, in his appropriate sphere, to govern her. Children are under perpetual obligation to parents, though the father may cast off the son.

The State.

Aristotle's conception of the State is quite characteristic. It does not rest on the family, or on the consent of the governed, but is formed by the wisest, the most gifted, for the general good. It does not aim at radical reformation of the masses, but only, as far as practicable, to hold their evil tendencies in check. Only the few can attain to the highest virtues, and their motive to this is simply the happiness resulting from virtue in this transitory life.

The State is to the citizen, the family, etc., as the animating body to its members. It presupposes the threefold subordination of husband and wife, parent and children, master and slave. Insisting more than Plato on the education of the citizen to higher freedom, he does not render the State so despotically absolute. But it is not the product of the moral life of the individuals, it is the necessary antecedent condition thereof. The State is the generator; the moral citizen, the product. The whole precedes the parts.

The relation of master and slave is a weighty element in the State. Aristotle was the first to give a formal theory and defense of slavery. Slavery is neither of legal nor of violent origin, it is natural. An artisan might as well be without tools as the head of a household without slaves. Slaves are to their masters as the body to the soul. Men are every-where of the two classes, the thoughtful and the unthinking, the governing and the governed. These are the body, those the soul, of the race. Nature makes the difference; and it is a blessing

to the lower classes that they are spiritually controlled and guided by the higher. These lower classes, these slaves by nature, Aristotle expressly says, are the non-Greeks, the barbarians. Slaves have no rights, and are as much in the power of their masters as are domestic animals.

Aristotle subjects the Platonic State to a sharp criticism. He rejects the community of goods and of wives; but in giving his own views he is not very explicit. He admits to a share in the Government only such as have leisure to cultivate the higher virtues. Day-laborers, artisans, and farmers are excluded. A normal State looks to the good of all of its free citizens. It may be a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a democracy of the free citizens. Abnormal perversions of these are tyranny, oligarchy, and universal democracy. It is always best that the most gifted should govern. Aristotle evidently prefers a constitutional monarchy. He greatly admired Alexander.

To secure a vigorous citizenship the State regulates marriage, and the care of children. Girls should marry at eighteen; men, at about thirty-seven. It prescribes the mode of life of the pregnant. "No physically defective (πεπηρωμένον) child is to be raised"—it is to be let perish. But where traditional laws forbid this, superfluous population must be prevented by abortion, brought about before the fœtus has life and feeling. The State oversees the rearing of children up to seven years, and then entirely assumes it. Boys are to be trained in grammar and drawing, gymnastics and music.

Slavery.

In none of the possible forms of the State does Aristotle rise to the idea of genuine freedom. Every-where it rests on slavery; nowhere does it look to educating the slaves into freemen. And it is no marked instance of impartiality when a modern, unchristian, self-styled humanitarian school would have us take the Greeks as the apostles of true humanitarianism, and their age and opinions as the "paradise of the human soul." The very opposite was the case. To the Greeks all non-Greeks were by nature only a sort of half-men. War upon them, and slavery for them, were the natural prerogatives of the Greeks. The Greek knows no mission of the word but only of the sword.

Greek Ethics at its Highest.

Non-Christian morality attained in Aristotle to its highest perfection. This morality is that of the natural and self-complaisant man. It lacks a consciousness of the historical origin and workings of sin, of the antagonism of the natural man to the moral idea, and of an earnest moral struggle against evil; and instead of this it presents a natural distinction of mankind into the morally incapable multitude and the naturally moral and free-born few. Morality rests not on religious consciousness, nor on love to God or man; but on a direct intellectual knowledge of the good on the part of man. Not love or benevolence, but *intellectual calculation of advantage*, is the motive to associations among mankind. Thus the ethical views of Aristotle, and hence of the Greeks, stand in direct antagonism to those of Christianity. And it is important to mark this, as a means of understanding the wide-reaching and often perverting influences of Aristotle on the development of Christian ethics even down to the present day.

The Christian consciousness rests throughout on the recognition of the necessity of general redemption, occasioned by the historical entrance of sin into the race. But of this Aristotle knows nothing; for, though he views the mass of mankind as incapable of high virtue, it is not because of an innate adverseness to virtue, but simply because of this normal non-endowment therefor—in some sense as brutes are thus non-endowed. And over against these he places the free Greek sage, who is absolutely and normally good, and, of course, without any need of redemption. And equally unchristian is the spirit of lofty self-respect and contemptuous unconcern with which these chosen few may, and do, look down upon all the rest of mankind.

In fact the perfect ideal of manhood, as conceived by the Greeks, is, in some essential respects, the very opposite of the Christian character. Take, as an example, the following picture of the magnanimous sage, as given by Aristotle himself, and which may justly be regarded as the highest ideal of character to which the Greek mind ever rose. In speaking of magnanimity, the crown of all the virtues, he says: "Magnanimous is he who is worthy of great things, and who esteems himself as worthy of great things. . . . The greatest of out-

ward goods is honor; the magnanimous man has, therefore, to act becomingly in regard to honor and dishonor. . . . As the magnanimous one is worthy of the greatest things, he must necessarily be perfectly good: to him belongs all that is great in every virtue; . . . hence it is very difficult to be magnanimous. . . . In great honors, and honors tendered to him by distinguished men, the magnanimous man rejoices, but moderately, as if such honors were due him, or even fell below his deserts; for to perfect virtue no sufficient honor can be offered. And yet he accepts it, because there can be no greater one shown him. But honors offered to him by ordinary men, or for unimportant things, he despises, for they are not worthy of him." After adding that favorable external circumstances are necessary to true magnanimousness, and that the magnanimous one thinks only very moderately of men and things, and esteems very few things so highly as to expose himself to dangers on their account, he continues: "He is inclined to confer benefits, but disdains to receive a favor; for the former benefits an eminent personage, while the latter implies inferiority. If he does receive a favor, however, he returns it in greater measure; for thereby the one who before had the advantage is now made a debtor. Also he gladly recalls to mind those to whom he has done favors, but not those from whom he has received favors! For the receiver of a benefit is subordinate to him who confers, whereas his own aim is, to be preeminent over others. For this reason he is glad to have the former (his benefactions) mentioned, but disdains to hear of the latter (the favors received). . . . He remains inactive and unconcerned when the matter is not one of great honor, nor a great work. He does but little, but what he does is great and brings fame. He is free-spoken, for he cherishes contempt. He speaks the truth, save when indulging in irony; and he does this when speaking with the masses. He is never astonished, for nothing seems great to him. . . . The movements of a magnanimous man are slow, his voice low-pitched, and his pronunciation measured. For he who is not interested for many things is in no hurry; and he who esteems nothing great is not enthusiastic." Such is Aristotle's picture of a μεγαλόψυχος. In the eyes of Christianity it is that of a courtly fool; but he proposes it to us as the *beau ideal* of virtue!

An essential defect in Aristotle's ethics, and one wherein it falls far below Plato's, is its lack of a religious character. It fails almost entirely to teach that morality is based on the will of God, that it brings man in communion with God, that man has a direct moral relation to God, and that piety is the mainspring of virtue. And this is all the more surprising as Aristotle's very correct conception of God as a rational, living, personal First Cause would naturally have led to such a view of the ground of morality. It was evidently not so much the logic of his philosophy as the general feebleness of the Greek religious consciousness that prevented him from giving morality a religious sanction.

But by this very failure he deprived morality of a sufficient motive. For he repeatedly asserts, as against Socrates, that the knowledge of the good does not necessarily lead to its performance; that, in fact, there may be an antagonism between knowing and willing. But if knowing the good does not lead to its willing, what does? It is not love, for that is only a phase of friendship, and hence is simply a single phenomenon of the moral life along side of many others. Misconceiving, thus, of the true nature of this element, which plays in Christianity so important a part—binding all mankind into one, and the whole to God—his ethical system lacks a sufficient anchorage, and is tossed hither and thither among sands and waves. And it is because of this want of knowledge of the moral power of love that Aristotle can assign no other motive for the civil virtues of the great multitude than that of fear. This admission of a possible antagonism between knowledge and volition, though evincing, on the one hand, that Aristotle was a less prejudiced observer of actual life than Socrates, yet, on the other, renders it impossible for him, consistently with his own ethical system, adequately to explain the phenomena of the moral life.

Art. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

HISTORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL—OF THE NEW DOCTRINE OF INFALLIBILITY. Our account of the Vatican Council in the last number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review" closed with the adoption of the *schema de fide* on the 26th of April. On the 29th of April the Council took a fresh start, the general congregation of that day beginning to discuss the reformed *schema* on the Little Catechism. The discussion was closed in the general congregation of April 30, and on May 11 the vote was taken, which resulted in its adoption. The total number of votes given was 591.

In the general congregation of the 13th of May the oral discussion on the important question of Papal Infallibility commenced. The *schema* was comprised in a preamble and four chapters, and was known to form the first part of the dogmatic constitution *de Ecclesia Christi*. Before being submitted to discussion the text of the *schema* had been distributed to the fathers, who in due course of time transmitted their observations upon it to the deputation *de fide*. These observations were then maturely examined by the members of the deputation, and a printed report of their views on them was sent to the residence of each Bishop. The debate itself is known to have been long and animated, many Bishops entering a very earnest protest against the promulgation of such an innovation. Authentic reports of the speeches have not yet been published; all correspondents from Rome designate Bishop Strossmayer, of Bosnia and Illyricum in Croatia; Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans in France; Archbishop Darboy, of Paris; Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg in Würtemberg; Cardinal Archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna; Cardinal Archbishop Prince Schwatzfenberg, of Prague, as those Bishops which spoke with the greatest effect against the proposed doctrine. The Roman correspondent of the *Catholic World*, of New York, Father Hecker, who gives the most interesting account of the Council which we have yet met in any Roman Catholic paper, thus classifies the Bishops who showed an opposition to the doctrine of Infallibility.

First in conviction, in determination, and in influence were the Gallicans, properly so called, who held and taught the very opposite of the proposed dogma. They were mostly men who had been bred in this teaching, and who deeply reverenced the memories of those who held and taught it in past times. This class was not very numerous, though it grew larger in the course of the Council by the accession of those whose examination of the question convinced them of the claim of Gallicanism to their adherence.

The second class comprised those who, believing the doctrine themselves, or, at least, favoring it speculatively, did not think it capable of definition, not deeming the tradition of the Church clear enough on this point.

A third class, the most numerous, regarded the definition as possible, but practically fraught with peril to the Church, as impeding conversions, as exasperating to governments. For the sake of peace, and for the good of souls, they would not see it proclaimed as of faith.

The regulations of the Council made it lawful for ten prelates to petition for the closing of a discussion; the propos i being then put to the vote of all the fathers, and the majority deciding. When fifty-five speeches had been made on the *schema* in general, one hundred and fifty Bishops sent a petition for closing the general discussion, which was accordingly done, to the great dissatisfaction of the opponents of Infallibility, a number of whom addressed to the Pope a protest against the closure of the general discussion, as it had deprived the Council of the opportunity to hear all the arguments against the new doctrine.

The secrecy which was enjoined upon all the members of the council has not been fully observed. A number of papers, and in particular the *Gazette of Augsburg*, succeeded not only in obtaining full accounts of the speeches, but even important documents which were to be kept secret. Several works even appeared, giving a detailed account of all the proceedings of the Council, and though it must not of course be expected that works of this kind are wholly free

from inaccuracies, it was hardly denied by any adherent of Rome that every important fact connected with the Council had found its way to the public prints. Special irritation was produced in Rome by a work published in Paris under the title, *Ce qui se passe du Concile*, because the minuteness of its statements was in itself conclusive proof that they were derived from members of the Council. These works specially impugned the freedom of the Council on three grounds:

1. The appointment of the congregation, the members of which were named by the sovereign pontiff, and who received or rejected the *postulata*, or propositions, to be presented to the Council for discussion.

2. The dogmatic deputation having been composed of those in favor of the definition, and the members having been put on it by management; moreover, this deputation exercised a controlling influence in the Council.

3. The interruption of those who were giving expression to their opinions in the exercise of their right to speak.

These charges have, however, not been brought only by the above pamphlets, but a number of Bishops have publicly expressed the same accusations, and in particular with regard to the third point a protest signed by a large number of Bishops was presented to the Pope.

The discussion of the *schema* as regards the whole and the several parts having been completed, a vote was taken according to the regulations in a general congregation on the 13th of July, on the whole *schema* by name, with *placet*, or *placet juxta modum* or *non-placet*. The result was as follows: 451 *placets*, 62 *placets juxta modum*, and 88 *non-placets*. Some of the *placets juxta modum* recommended the insertion of words that would make the decree clearer and stronger. The *schema* was accordingly altered and the amendments were retained in the general congregation, held Saturday, July 16th. On Sunday morning was distributed a *monitum*, by which the fathers were notified that the fourth public session would be held on Monday, July 18th, at nine o'clock. The 18th of July will henceforth be a memorable day in the history of the Church. The feeling among the Bishops appears not to have been a very joyous one. Even Father Hecker writes in his report:

The thought that, although a great and most beneficial act was to be done, still there were not a few of the fathers who thought otherwise than the majority in a matter about to be made binding on the conscience of all, was not calculated to heighten the external manifestations of cheerfulness, whatever feelings of thankfulness to Providence for the event was in the heart.

At nine o'clock Cardinal Barili began a low mass without chant. At the end of it the small throne for the Gospels was placed on the altar and upon it the copy of the Scriptures. In a few moments the Pope entered, preceded by the Senate and the officers of the court, and went to his throne in the apsis of the aula. The customary prayers were recited by him; the litany of the saints was chanted and the "Veni Creator Spiritus" intoned, the people present taking part; after which the Bishop of Fabriano ascended the pulpit and read the schema to be voted on, and finished with asking the fathers whether it pleased them. Next the name of each prelate was called, when 534 answered *placet*, 2 replied *non-placet*, and 106 were absent, some because sick, the far greater number not willing to vote favorably. As soon as the result was made known officially to Pius IX., he announced the fact of all with the exception of two having given a favorable vote, "Wherefore," he continued, "by virtue of our apostolic authority, with the approval of the sacred Council, we define, confirm, and approve the decree and canons just read." The crowd outside of the hall shouted *Viva Pio Nono; Papa infallibile*, and the Pope intoned the *Te Deum*. The session ended with the apostolic benediction from the Pope, accompanied by an indulgence for all assisting.

The following is a faithful translation of Chapter IV. of the schema, which treats of Papal infallibility:

OF THE INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF IN TEACHING.

This holy see hath ever held—the unbroken custom of the Church doth prove—and the Œcumenical Councils, those especially in which the East joined with the West in union of faith and of charity, have declared that in this apostolic primacy, which the Roman Pontiff holds over the universal Church, as successor of Peter the prince of the Apostles, there is also contained the supreme power of authoritative teaching. Thus the Fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, put forth this solemn profession:

"The first law of salvation is to keep

the rule of true faith. And whereas the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, (Matt. xvi, 18,) these words, which he spake, art proved true by facts; for in the apostolic see the Catholic religion has ever been preserved unspotted and the holy doctrine has been announced. Therefore, wishing never to be separated from the faith and teaching of this see, we hope to be worthy to abide in that one communion which the apostolic see preaches, in which is the full and true firmness of the Christian religion." [Formula of St. Hormisdas, Pope, as proposed by Hadrian II. to the Fathers of the Eighth General Council, (Constantinop. IV.,) and subscribed by them.]

So too, the Greeks, with the approval of the second Council of Lyons, professed that the holy Roman Church holds over the universal Catholic Church a supreme and full primacy and headship, which she truthfully and humbly acknowledges that she received, with fullness of power, from the Lord himself in blessed Peter, the prince or head of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor; and as she, beyond the others, is bound to defend the truth of the faith, so, if any questions arise concerning faith, they should be decided by her judgment. And, finally, the Council of Florence defined that the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding and ruling and governing the universal Church, (John xxi, 15–17.)

In order to fulfill this pastoral charge our predecessors have ever labored unwearedly to spread the saving doctrine of Christ among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care have watched to preserve it pure and unchanged where it had been received. Wherefore the Bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in synods, following the long established custom of the Churches, (S. Cyril, Alex. and S. Cœlest. Pap.,) and the form of ancient rule, (St. Innocent I. to Councils of Carthage and Milevi,) referred to this apostolic see those dangers especially which arose in matters of faith, in order that injuries to faith might best be healed there where the faith could never fail. (St. Bernard ep. 190.) And the Roman Pontiffs, weighing the condition of times and circumstances, sometimes calling together general councils, or asking the judgment of the Church scattered through the world, sometimes consulting particular synods, sometimes using such other aids as Divine providence supplied, defined that those doctrines should be held, which, by the aid of God, they knew to be conformable to the holy Scriptures and the apostolic traditions. For the Holy Ghost is not promised to the successors of Peter, that they may make known new doctrine revealed by him, but that, through his assistance, they may sacredly guard and faithfully set forth the revelation delivered by the Apostles, that is, the deposit of faith. And this the apostolic teaching all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have revered and followed, knowing most certainly that this see of St. Peter ever remains free from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Saviour made to the prince of the Apostles: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren. (Conf. St. Agatho, Ep. ad Imp. a Conc. Œcum. VI. approbat.)

Therefore, this gift of truth, and of faith which fails not, was divinely bestowed on Peter and his successors in this chair, that they should exercise their high office for the salvation of all, that through them the universal flock of Christ should be turned away from the poisonous food of error and should be nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine, and that, the occasion of schism being removed, the entire Church should be preserved one, and, planted on her foundation, should stand firm against the gates of hell.

Nevertheless, since in this present age, when the saving efficacy of the apostolic office is exceedingly needed, there are not a few who carp at its authority, we judge it altogether necessary to solemnly declare the prerogative which the only begotten Son of God has designed to unite to the supreme pastoral office.

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition handed down from the commencement of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian peoples, with the approbation of the sacred council, we teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed, that, when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in the exercise of his office of Pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolical authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine of faith and morals; and therefore that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto.

And if any one shall presume, which

God forbid, to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema.

Given in Rome, in the Public Session, solemnly celebrated in the Vatican Basilica, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate. Ita est.

JOSEPH, BISHOP OF ST. POLTEN,
Secretary of the Council of the Vatican.

A large number of the Bishops returned home immediately after the promulgation of the doctrine, and it is announced that the regular proceedings of the Council will not be taken up again until some time in November.

There appeared to be a difference of opinion as to whether the Infallibility of the Pope was to be regarded as a doctrine of the Church immediately after the promulgation, or only after the signing of all of the acts of the Council by the Bishops at the close of the transactions. A letter from Cardinal Antonelli to one of the Papal Nuncios declared in the name of the Pope that Rome regarded Infallibility as a doctrine of the Church from the moment of its promulgation, and that it would regard as a heretic every body who would refuse submission.

The great war which broke out soon after the promulgation of Papal Infallibility averted public opinion both from the Council and from the attitude of the Opposition. The Bishops belonging to the Opposition acted with great reserve. Many theological scholars, on the contrary, were very outspoken in rejecting both the doctrine and the claims of the Council to an œcumenical character. Among those who publicly refused submission were Father Hyacinthe, of France, and a large number of theological scholars in Germany, one of whom, Professor Michelis, of France, declared the Pope to be a heretic.

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York.)—1. Sin and Suffering in the Universe. (Concluded.) Oosterzee's Theology of the New Testament. 3. Farrar on the Constitution. 4. The Problem of History. 5. The Mather Papers. 6. Protoplasm, or the Physical Basis of Life. 7. The Relation of Theology to the Preparatory Sciences. 8. The Felicity of God. 9. A New Analysis in Fundamental Morals. 10. New German Theological Literature.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Miracles. 2. Subterranean Rome. 3. Bible Chronology. 4. Gladstone's Juventus Mundi. 5. Exegesis of Hebrews xii, 18–24. 6. The True Humanity of Christ. 7. Exegetical Studies.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York.)—1. Tholuck's View of the Right Way of Preaching. 2. Heathen Views on the Golden Age, etc., compared with the Bible. 3. The Brothers Valdés. 4. Ecclesiastical History of the Venerable Bede. 5. The Trial Period in History. 6. The General Assembly. 7. The Delegation to the Southern General Assembly. 8. The Evangelical Alliance. 9. Minority Representation in the Diocese of New Jersey.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, July, 1870. (Andover.)—1. The Crucifixion on Thursday—not Friday. 2. The Doctrine of the Apostles. 3. The Creative Period in History. 4. Recent Questions of Unbelief. 5. Demosthenes, and the Rhetorical Principles Established by his Example. 6. Revelation and Inspiration. 7. Exposition of 2 Cor. v, 14. 8. The Topography of Jerusalem. 9. Explorations in Palestine.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Law of Liberty. 2. The Law of Divorce. 3. Christian Experience. 4. Education of Children. 5. A Page of History and a Line of Revelation. 6. The Infallibility Dogma.

CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Boston.) 1. Joseph Abbott. 2. The Pilgrim Fathers. 3. A Disquisition Concerning Ecclesiastical Councils. 4. The Biblical Position of Woman. 5. Veni, Sancte Spiritus. 6. Extempore Preaching. 7. A National Conference. 8. Luther's Prayer. 9. Congregational Necrology.

CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW, July, 1870. (Chicago.)—1. Theism and Anti-Theism in their Relations to Science. 2. The Roots of Infant Baptism. 3. Probation Beyond Death. 4. The Doctrine of the Divine Name. 5. Theron Baldwin, D.D. 6. An Address at the Pilgrim Memorial Convention, held in Chicago, April 28, 1870.

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Schmid's Dogmatic Theology. Translated from the German and Latin. 2. Reminiscences of Lutheran Ministers. 3. Luther at the Diet of Worms. Translated from the Original Narrative. Published at Jena, in 1557. 4. Mission Work in the Lutheran Church of this Country. 5. The Divine Government: Rev. iv. 6. Martin Chemnitz and the Council of Trent. 7. Life and Writings of Flavius Josephus. 8. In Essentials, Unity. 9. Tennyson. 10. Eight Years among the Hindoos. 11. The Music and Song of the Ages.

MERCERSBURG REVIEW, July, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Organic Redemption. 2. Casper Schwenkfeld and the Schwenkfelders. 3. Union with the Church. 4. The Ministry Adapted to the Times. 5. What is Heaven? 6. The Mystery of Iniquity. 7. Dogmatic Theology.

NEW ENGLANDER, July, 1870. (New Haven.)—1. St. Francis and his Time. 2. Is there a Probation between Death and the Judgment? 3. Henry Ward Beecher. 4. The Free Churches of England. 5. Yale College—Some Thoughts Respecting its Future. 6. How the Rev. Dr. Stone Bettered his Situation. 7. Address of M. de Pressensé, at Amsterdam, on the Bible and the School. 8. President McCosh's Logic.

NEW ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER AND ANTIQUARIAN JOURNAL, July, 1870. (Boston.)—1. Discourse of the Rev. Edmund F. Slafter, A.M. 2. Thomas Sherwin, A.M. 3. The Preble Family. 4. The Squamscott Patent. 5. Letter from Rev. Solomon Stoddard to Governor Dudley. 6. Commissions from Royal Governors of Massachusetts. 7. An American Shrine—The First Church in Charlestown. 8. Instructions to Matthew Cary about bringing Prisoners from Canada. 9. Unpublished Letters. 10. Josiah Barker, and his Connection with Ship-Building in Massachusetts. 11. The Coffin Family. 12. Stephen Bryant and his Descendants. 13. Bibliography of the Local History of Massachusetts. 14. Documents Relating to the Colonial History of Connecticut. 15. Notes and Queries. 16. N. E. Historic Genealogical Society.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, July, 1870. (Boston.)—1. American Art Museums. 2. The Session. 3. Competitive Examinations in China. 4. Our Currency, Past and Future. 5. Luther, and the early German Struggles for Freedom. 6. The Labor Question. 7. Chaucer.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Boston.)—1. Credibility and Inspiration of the New Testament. 2. The Time of Job. 3. The Septuagint. 4. The Moravian Missions. 5. Punishment. 6. The Historical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans with Especial Reference to Baur's Theory. 7. The Vestry, and its Uses. 8. Universalism a Practical Power. 9. Contributions to the History of Universalism.

II. *English Reviews.*

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (London.) 1. Freeman's History of the Norman Conquest. 2. The Education and Employment of Women. 3. Suggestions for the Repression of Crime. 4. The Congregational Ministry and its Education. 5. The Literary Character of Mr. Disraeli. 6. The Council of the Vatican. 7. Mr. Matthew Arnold and Puritanism.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.) 1. The Text of Chaucer. 2. The Baltic Provinces of Russia. 3. The Chief Victories of Charles V. 4. Galton on Hereditary Genius. 5. Sainte-Beuve. 6. Manuals of Ancient History. 7. Faraday. 8. Postal Telegraphs. 9. The Adventures of Audubon. 10. Disraeli's Lothair.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.) 1. Earl Stanhope's Reign of Queen Anne. 2. The Church and the Age. 3. Mr. Disraeli's Lothair. 4. The Police of London. 5. Dr. Newman's Grammar of Assent. 6. Baths and Bathing Places, Ancient and Modern. 7. The Rig Veda. 8. Letter-Writing. 9. Administration of the Army.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Assyrian Annals, B. C. 681-625. 2. Parpaglia's Mission to Queen Elizabeth. 3. Ben Jonson's Quarrel with Shakspeare. 4. Dr. Newman's Grammar of Assent. 5. Lothair. 6. Agriculture and Agrarian Laws in Prussia. 7. The Cisleithan Constitutional Crisis.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (London.) 1. Michael Faraday. 2. The War in Paraguay. 3. Albert Durer. 4. Freeman's Norman Conquest. 5. The Licensing System. 6. Land Tenure. 7. The Bremen Apologetic Lectures. 8. St. Paul and Protestantism.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.) 1. Unpublished Letters, written by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 2. Indian Taxation; Lord Cornwallis's Land Settlement. 3. The Nationality Question in Austria. 4. The Future of the British Empire. 5. Shelley. 6. Colonial and American Pauperism. 7. Roman Catholicism: Present and Future.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, July, 1870. (London.) 1. Venice. 2. The Two Purifications of the Temple. 3. M. Baius and the Foundations of Jansenism. 4. Speculation and Practice; some Liberal Tendencies Considered. 5. Luthardt on Free Will and Grace. 6. John Jewel. 7. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné on the Council and Infallibility. 8. The Silence of Women in the Churches.

This Quarterly furnishes the following opinion of M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia:*

It promises, when completed, to be beyond doubt the most comprehensive and valuable publication of the kind in the English language. The literature of all nations is laid under contribution to enrich its pages. The senior editor, Dr. M'Clintock, we regret to learn, died a few months ago amid his useful labors. He long occupied a prominent place in his own denomination, but was held in universal esteem among all the Churches of America. The preparation of materials for his department of the *Cyclopædia* engaged his anxious care. His work was so far completed when the Master summoned him away to his rest. The final revision of the remaining portions of this great work will devolve on Professor Strong and a large staff, thirty-one in number, of able coadjutors, who have all along been associated with the editors in the undertaking. We trust the publishers will be enabled to bring to a successful conclusion the enterprise they have hitherto so ably conducted, and thereby to confer a lasting benefit on the Church of Christ.

And the following notice of Professor Winchell's *Sketches of Creation:*

A more interesting and intelligent guide we could not wish. He combines scientific accuracy with a vividness and beauty of description which we have never seen equaled. His work is from beginning to end a grand panorama. The reader's attention is sustained throughout, and, while his mind is informed, his heart cannot but be stirred with feelings of awe and reverence, forcing from his lips the

adoring cry, "O Lord! how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches."

We thank Dr. Winchell for the great pleasure the perusal of this excellent and beautifully illustrated volume has afforded us, and we hope that he will be enabled to carry out his expressed intention of dealing in a subsequent work with the whole question of the relations of science to the Christian faith, a subject of pressing importance in the present day.

Art. IX.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Prophecy a Preparation for Christ. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1869, on the Bampton Foundation. By R. Payne Smith, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. 12mo., pp. 397. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard & Co. 1870.

How clearly the Bible is a supernatural book, a self-evident miracle, is, from the neglect of a critical study of the connection between the Old Testament and the New, very inadequately realized. The whole drift of the Old looks forward to the New, the whole self-assertion of the New looks back to the Old. There are thousands of mutual ties, some of them minute fibers singly easy to break, others strong cords, forming in the whole a oneness of the two unparalleled in the history of human thought. This miraculous circularity is not to be found in any of the sacred books of the unchristian nations—the Vedas, the Shasters, or the Korans. It belongs to the Bible alone, and thus places the Bible *as alone* among all written monuments.

Dr. Smith's book is one of the most important efforts in our language at unfolding this miracle and making it patent to the mind of the Church. It is a historical survey of Old Testament prophecy especially in its anticipations of Christ and the Gospel ages. He first analyzes the nature of prophecy and the precise character of the ancient prophet from the earliest antiquity. Its rise is dim and sporadic in the twilight of antiquity. The prophet is not purely predictor, but revealer of the Divine mind, whether in regard to the future, present, or past. His utterance is oral, and his impulses and existence occasional.

At the close of the age of the Judges a great character arose, wonderful for his endowments, intellectual, ethical, and supernatural—the Prophet Samuel. He was the reformer of the past and the founder of a new era. Corresponding to his great character was the divine effusion of spiritual endowment that marked the

epoch. Thereby he was enabled to establish *the school of the prophets*, a sacred University, which, in a form more or less definite, remained until the captivity. This divine thrill from on high quickened the genius of Israel in every department of thought and life, and the intellectual and moral being of the nation moved thenceforward on a higher plane. Happy day, when every branch of human improvement recognized itself as but a radiation from the Divine! In Samuel's college there was one rare youth, the strains of whose inspired genius still roll in our ears and elevate our souls to God; one who as warrior, royal statesman, and sacred lyrist, was, despite of grievous errors, to render his name the type of that great Unknown who stood in the future as the "Hope of Israel." From Samuel and the Judgeship to David and the monarchy was an ascending step in theocratic history.

The next great epoch was the inauguration of written prophecy. When the monarchy arose and Jerusalem became the national center, a varied literature sprung into existence, the monarchs themselves leading the movement; books were published, libraries established and an enlightened public mind created. The sacred colleges were led by men of divine endowments, who studied with earnest interest the teachings of their predecessors as the basis whence their premonitions augured the divine purposes and shot their predictions farther and clearer into the future. Each prophet did not stand in a bleak lonesomeness. A critical general mind, scarce inferior to that of the prophet himself, judged his manifestations and embodied utterance after utterance into established doctrine. But for a long time the predictive utterances were oral. At length, when the brief power of Assyria was at its height, Jonah wrote his book announcing the wonderful fact of mercy upon repentance even for Heathendom—the first great startling type of the call of the Gentiles! Then followed Joel, announcing the great catholic truths quoted by Peter at the Pentecost. From the catholic generality of these two primal prophets Isaiah rises to deduce the most specific delineations of the coming God-man. In him prophecy culminates. Micah is his not unworthy contemporary in the sacred college. Then, through Jeremiah and Daniel, down to Malachi, numerous additional touches are given by each successive hand to finish out the picture of the Future One.

To the argument from this phenomenon of *prediction*, so patent in the Bible, so unparalleled in any other literature, there is no adequate answer. The Pantheistic axiom, *there can be no super-*

natural, is the sole ground upon which all counter-argument is based. But for this primal assumption of skepticism the phenomenon would be at once admitted, and the self-styled "higher criticism" would have no existence. On this basis it is first objected that prophecies *are obscure;* but the reply is, Fling out every obscure prediction and the perfectly clear ones are superabundant. It is next assumed that when they are clear they are written *after the event;* but the reply is, That all the events of Christianity, so clearly predicted, took place long after the Septuagint translation of the old canon; while other predictions, as the Jewish dispersion, are being fulfilled at the present hour.

With regard to the Messianic predictions the last subterfuge is that they fulfilled themselves: or, as Strauss puts it, the early Christians constructed the Christ-history out of the Old Testament delineations. And that subterfuge concedes a great deal. It admits the existence of the Messianic ideal fully and specifically formed in the Old Testament and held by the Jewish Church. And now Dr. Smith furnishes in a concluding lecture the proof that the historic Christ of Christianity, so far from identity with this formation by the Jewish mind from old prophecy, is quite a reverse character from that ideal, and is yet *the true fulfilment*. The Jewish national ambition had so distorted the prophetic ideal as to make it a fictitious character. Christianity brought out the ideal into a true reality. And nobody was more taken by surprise at this process than Christianity itself. Nothing can be more intuitively natural and true than the description of the conceptive change taking place in the apostolic minds while out of the false Jewish Messiahship the true Jesus Messiahship according to prophecy breaks upon the apostolic view.

Dr. Smith frankly, and with some dissatisfaction, admits that his work cannot treat one tenth part of the matter really at hand. His limits allow him only to show by a brilliant specimen what can be done. He is keenly logical, richly eloquent, learned and devout, dealing fearlessly and with polished sarcasm with the haughtiest and latest skepticism; but, much and successfully as he achieves, he suggests far more. How little can he say of those rich topics, Moses, Ezekiel and Daniel. But the student, the theologian or the preacher, will find the whole prophetic field largely illuminated to his eye by studying first this work, then Fairbain on Prophecy, and then Fairbain's Typology.

Essay on Divorce and Divorce Legislation. By THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, L.L.D., President of Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

The Christian Doctrine of Marriage. By HUGH DAVEY EVANS, L.L.D. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1870.

There are numerous indications that the legislation of the United States in the matters of marriage and divorce is to be subjected to severe scrutiny. That legislation is in a confused and well-nigh chaotic condition. This confusion results naturally from the fact that such legislation is entrusted not to Congress but to the several State legislatures. Hence we have precisely the same codes in no two States. In South Carolina, until recently, no divorce was granted for any cause. In Indiana divorce is granted for every cause ever conceived by Jewish or American "hardness of heart." Hence it has often happened that the legal husband of one woman in a particular State has been the legal husband of another woman in a different State. People migrate to other States that they may be divorced on grounds not deemed admissible in the States where they reside. Hence it has become easy for any person who has grown weary of the matrimonial yoke to escape from its bondage. Public opinion is so far debauched that persons seek divorce for trifling causes without any great sense of wrong-doing or shame. Laxity is invading the Churches. The Catholics alone execute the New Testament rule in this matter. The members of other communions sometimes obtain divorces on grounds not sanctioned in the Bible, sometimes marry persons thus divorced; and ministers of these communions are often invited to solemnize such unscriptural unions. Some ministers marry these parties, while others refuse so to prostitute their office. Some ministers have even been married to persons who have been unscripturally divorced. The ecclesiastical bodies to which they are amenable have sometimes disciplined such ministers, and sometimes have not, the tendency being toward laxity. Examples of all the cases just enumerated have fallen under the personal notice of the present writer.

A condition of affairs so detrimental to civil and ecclesiastical prosperity has naturally aroused the attention of thoughtful men.

The book of President Woolsey is mainly an attempt to define the legislation of Christ on this subject. The first chapter discusses divorce among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. He shows that in the time of our Lord these nations had practically abolished the legal sanctity of marriage. They had long allowed separation on the most frivolous grounds. Hence, when Jesus

Christ said, "But I say unto you that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery," he both condemned the existing practice of Jewish and pagan society, and re-affirmed the law of primal humanity as the marriage law of his Church. The author clearly shows that Christ allowed divorce solely for fornication. He proves plainly that the practice and the teachings of Paul were in harmony with the teachings of the Saviour. He demonstrates that the early Church understood the words of the Saviour and of St. Paul in this sense. He shows that the Catholic Church, through its tendency to exalt celibacy as a virtue of perfection, exaggerated the severity of the rule of Jesus; and that when the sacramental notion of marriage crept in divorce was not even allowed for the cause of adultery.

This Catholic exaggeration led to an undue reaction in the fathers of the Reformation. Divorce was granted by them for many causes not allowed in the word of God. This looser view of matrimonial obligations has led to the relaxed legislation of modern and Protestant nations. The law of the Church and of the State has been one wherever the National Church system has existed in full vigor.

It surely becomes all Churches of the Lord Jesus which are untrammeled by the State to make the rule of Christ their rule and the practice of the primitive Church their practice. Particularly should the American Churches make their legislation such that all their members, officers, and ministers shall know beyond all doubt whether any particular act is or is not a violation of the order and discipline of the bodies to which they belong. It is a question which we may fairly submit to our Bishops and to our next General Conference, whether some precise legislation should not require both our ministry and membership to obey the New Testament law on this subject, or be subjected to a stringent ecclesiastical discipline. President Woolsey's treatise will be a valuable aid in the formation of correct views in this matter. May it light all our Churches on their path to a more consistent practice.

The style of the book is solid and compact, its arrangement of topics excellent, and its mechanical execution creditable. Sometimes a bad sentence slips carelessly from the author's pen. He has several times over rendered the German word *Prozess* by the English "process," where it really means a lawsuit; and *pro-*

jet de loi and other like phrases are sometimes rendered too literally to convey their true meaning.

Mr. Evans's book shows learning, industry, and excellent printing; but it is heavy reading—one of those books, like Guicciardini's Wars of Pisa, rather than finish which one would willingly go to prison.

The Heavenly Father. Lectures on Modern Atheism. By ERNEST NAVILLE, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, (Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences,) late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Geneva. Translated from the French by HENRY DOWNTON, M.A., English Chaplain at Geneva. 12mo., pp. 364. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1865.

Life Eternal. From the French of M. ERNEST NAVILLE, late Professsor of Philosophy in the University of Geneva. Translated by special permission. 12mo., pp. 253. London: W. H. Dalton. 1867.

Three courses of lectures were delivered by Ernest Naville at Geneva and at Lausanne, entitled respectively, The Heavenly Father, The Life Eternal, and The Problem of Evil. The first two have been translated into various languages—in English as above indicated. The third is translated by Professor Lacroix, of the Ohio Wesleyan University, with a sanction and a preface from the author, and will soon be issued by our own publishing house.

From a purely philosophical stand-point Naville asserts that God, Immortality, and Christianity possess imperative claims upon our belief. The Professor's chair sustains the divine authority of the Christian pulpit. "The author having few rivals on the Continent in the graces of polished eloquence," his public deliverances were attended by crowds and produced a very impressive effect. Their publication in different countries was demanded by the exigencies of the hour as a power in the great collision of moral forces now existing in Europe. The mind interested in the momentous topics discussed is borne along by the full current of a lucid, exuberant and rapid eloquence. Profound problems are discussed, not in condensed style or technical phrases intelligible to professionals alone, but in a series of luminous diffuse touches, taking even to a popular audience intelligent enough to be awakened to such high themes.

Naville's argument in the first volume shows historically that pure Theism was the first creed of the race and Polytheism the corruption: and that true Theism has been elucidated and re-asserted to the reason of man by no other means than the Hebraic records, perfected by the teachings of Christ. He then pictures the moral chaos in the mind from which God is blotted out first in the individual, and then in society. For the human soul, both

individually and collectively, God is the key-stone that binds the faculties into unity and capacitates them for harmonious and perfect action. He then takes a broad survey of the influences of the "Revival of Atheism" in the mind of Europe. This is a saddening chapter. It seems as if religion were to be wrecked and man's higher nature be swallowed in a base animality. But no! The Divine Pilot is on shipboard. The atheist's triumphal song, "Jehovah is dead," would, were it true, be indeed the requiem of our race. But the blessed hymn, "Christ is risen indeed," which can never be silenced, is the glorious anthem of our immortality. Naville next surveys the theories of modern Atheism, and exposes their contradictions, their tendencies, and their debasement. He then unfolds the argument for God from nature. Finally, he presses with great force and beauty the doctrine that God is not merely the Creator, but that creation is the offspring of Goodness, and that therefore God stands to us in the relation which the word Father feebly shadows. Brevity obliges him to give but the positive side of the argument for the paternal view; the objections drawn from the dark facts of the world are reserved for answer in his *Problem of Evil*. The vigorous logician would often prefer a terser argument; many difficulties are unmet, and many an argument unpressed. But the lectures flow in a stream of fresh and vigorous thought, abounding with fine passages and beautiful illustrations, apposite anecdotes, portraitures of character, and striking quotations both from opponents and supporters of the argument.

The volume on Eternal Life states the argument against Materialism, and then unfolds with great clearness the immeasurable superiority of Christianity over the most boasted rival systems, whether of classic philosophy or Buddhist religion, in presenting a worthy view of man's responsibility and immortality. Christianity is demonstrated to be the only religion for the human race.

One is struck throughout both volumes with the pure and noble spirit of the author. Candor in argument, kindness toward every opponent, however severe the reprobation of his degrading dogmas, a cheery elevation of spirit, and a glow of joyous piety winding off at the close of each volume in Christian triumph, leave an impression of light and happiness perfectly in contrast with the volumes of skepticism closing in darkness and gloom as to man's eternal destiny. A powerful realization remains that the dignity of our nature, the value of virtue, truth and

honor, the hopes of human progress, and the firm anticipation of immortality, are all bound up in the Gospel faith.

The "Revival of Atheism," heralded and prepared in its way by self-styled "radical Christianity," is struggling for a mighty demonstration in our own country. Doubtless it is to be met by the Church with a deeper self-consecration and the grasp of a still firmer faith upon the cross of Christ. So consecrated and so faithful we shall wage a fearless, though terrible battle, sure of victory through the blood of the Lamb. And part of the weaponry of that battle is the issue from our press of the master efforts of champions of the evangelical faith like Pressensé and Naville.

The Early Years of Christianity. By E. De Pressensé, D.D., Author of "Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work." Translated by Annie Harwood. The Apostolic Era. 12mo., pp. 536. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The present is the first of four volumes, each complete in itself, yet following in series, in which Pressensé proposes to portray the history of the early Church. His Life of Christ was the prelude to this great work. His object is to checkmate the efforts of Renan and others who would clothe the results of negative and destructive criticism in the form of vivid narrative to fascinate the popular mind, by presenting a counter statement of the story which shall be sustainable by a thorough criticism and yet win the public attention. Church history has hitherto worn a very dry and repulsive aspect even to the professional student. Until Milman wrote it has been truly said that Gibbon was the only classic English Church historian. We imported Mosheim who furnished us with the substance of the matter, as solid as statistics and as arid. Neander gives us the spiritual life of the Church, yet in a lax and hazy style. But to Pressensé both French and English criticism have given the palm for making this, the garden of God, blossom as the rose. The young Church walks forth in the dew of her youth, with the light of heaven in her eye, and the bloom of morning on her cheek. By flinging the discussion of knotty problems into an appendix of critical notes, he leaves the body of his volume free for fresh-flowing narrative and pictorial statement. The pages of the work are, therefore, interesting alike to the critical student, the popular preacher, and the literary reader.

The full work is to embrace the great conflict of the Church with Paganism. In the present volume is contained the history of the Apostolic Age, commencing with the Pentecost and closing

with the close of St. John's career. It is a picture of the Christianity of the first century, with its expansions, its apostolic leaders, its growing institutes, its struggles with persecution, its forming of the canon, its doctrinal announcements, its heresies, its spiritual life. Based primarily upon the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles, illustrated by the most authentic documents of the age, and tested by the keenest criticism of our skeptical era, we have a work for our times. It is intrinsically one of the most momentous of histories. It embraces a period and a train of events pregnant with the destiny of ages then future, and of ages yet future. It opens up problems of the highest interest to the human soul.

The work is published from our press in a liberal spirit, rather for its rich evangelic tone than because it represents in all respects our own theology. It is published, indeed, with our *carent* on that point. The theology of Pressensé is not Augustinian, nor Calvinistic, nor to the last shade Arminian; but may, perhaps, be called Melanchthonian. He holds the European lax views of the Sabbath against which evangelical England and America protest. He has not the slightest doubt that immersion is the New Testament mode of baptism.

On the subject of the atonement his views are peculiar and may attract the attention of the evangelical Church. He does not adopt the Anselmian view of substitution. He does not hold that Christ suffered the penalty of the sinner's guilt as Damon might have suffered for Pythias's deed, by dying in his stead. His view is that as our representative Adam separated us from God by a great act of disobedience, so our representative Christ restores us to God by the highest act of obedience, even the suffering of death. Birth from Adam brings us under the headship of disobedient Adam; faith in Christ brings us under the headship of obedient Christ. Yet since *death* was the penalty for sin, so Christ, by suffering *death*, suffered that penalty for us. He became a *curse* for us, for cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. By this view of the matter he holds that all the texts of Scripture are fully satisfied and their true meaning completely expressed.

Pressensé denies a second imprisonment of Paul, holding the argument of Wieseler on that subject conclusive. He maintains the authenticity of all the canonical Epistles of Paul and that of Second Peter. He favors the theory that Apollos was the author of the Book of Hebrews, and maintains its rightful place in the canon. He defends St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse and gives a brief view of the import of that book.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Friedrich Rückert. Ein biographisches Denkmal. Von Dr. C. Beyer. Pp. xvi, 471. Frankfort-am-Main: J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag. 1868.

Since the death of Rückert in 1866 various monographs, critical sketches, and eulogistic *Erinnerungen* have been issued for the purpose of analyzing and interpreting his works, illustrating his character, or affectionately rehearsing the story of his life; but Dr. Beyer's volume is the first book that can make any claim to be called a biography of the German poet. The calm and comparatively uneventful course of Rückert's external life is described with rather more fullness, we think, than the meager materials would justify. His lineage, nativity, childhood, and all the associations and influences that may possibly have stimulated the boy's imagination or contributed to the formation of his mind and character; the natural scenery, myths and romantic legends of Oberlauringen, where his youth was spent; the peculiarities of the village people with whom he came in contact, as well as the prominent features of the country and population for ten miles about, are dwelt upon with that fondness for minute details which so often swells a German biography into a combination of local guide-book and contemporary history, and exhausts not only the subject, but also the reader's patience. The sentimental experiences and misplaced attachments of the youth are all conscientiously related—his Arcadian dreams and successive affections to Aunel, and Agnes, and even the innkeeper's daughter, "*Amarylis formosissima*," to whom he addressed innumerable love poems full of classical allusions to "Olympian gods" and "Thessalian sorceresses," of which the naive and rosy-cheeked beer-maiden had no more definite idea than the Dublin fish-woman had of "parallelopipedon," as an epithet of abuse or a term of endearment. The account which is given of Rückert's juvenile poems and prose compositions presents no points of special interest except the remarkable facility in the use of the Latin language which these productions of a school-boy of fifteen years exhibit. The poem quoted on page 28 as "the oldest monument" of his muse is certainly very finished and elegant; not even the most brilliant *Primaner* of a German gymnasium could be expected to compose such polished verses. Our only surprise is that neither Dr. Beyer nor Professor Heinrich Rückert, in whose possession the original manuscript is said to be, should have recognized the stanzas as Ovid's.

In the autumn of 1805 he began the study of law at the Uni-

versity of Würzburg, in obedience to his father's wishes. But this profession was to him one of the driest of bread and butter sciences, and he turned for relief to philology and belles lettres. At the same time he became deeply interested in Wagner's system of idealism, a philosophy which he afterward characterized as "a chaotic medley of unripe empiricism and unripe speculation." The fruits of his philological researches were subsequently embodied in a dissertation on the idea of philology, (*Dissertatio philologico-philosophica de idea Philologiæ*, as the title runs,) which he defended before the Faculty of Jena in 1811, as he entered upon the duties of *Privatdocent* in that University. Notwithstanding the excess of metaphysical subtlety in this inaugural dissertation, it presents a more philosophic and cosmopolitan view of linguistic science than Eichstädt, Gabler, and the other academic periwigs of that day had as yet had any presentiment of. His discussion of root words is acute but unsatisfactory. The vowels, he says, are the real, the consonants the ideal parts of language; the vowels are the body, the consonants the soul; the vowels represent feeling and femininity, the consonants represent intelligence and masculinity; all vowels are derived from *a*, all consonants from *h*. From a combination of these letters, *eh*, he deduces a series of radical words, such as *Ehe*, matrimony, (*est matrimonium a deo institutum est, quia* ehe *est* eh *divinum, quod in humanitatem descendit,*) *Ich*, denoting personality, etc. The author himself seems to have had an inkling of the fantastic absurdity of his etymologies, as he closes this portion of his essay with a timely warning against any manifestations of convulsive merriment on the part of the reader—*Absit risus profanorum!* Even his statement of the relations of vowels to consonants is entirely incorrect. Grimm and Ewald have shown conclusively that the more intellectual and spiritual qualities of language depend upon the light and flexible vowel, whereas the more material qualities inhere in the sturdy and long consonant; the consonants determine the form of the word, the vowels determine its function; the consonants furnish the substance which the vowels light up and define.

But it would be unjust to make these etymological quiddities the measure of Rückert's philological ability. His genius for linguistic studies, which has been characterized by one of his friends as "something incomprehensible and almost demoniacal," was not more remarkable than the intense and untiring energy with which he pursued them. Few pedagogues, even of the most

inveterate type, have ever labored with the "iron industry" of Rückert during the six years (1820–1826) which he spent as *Privatgelehrter* at Coburg, and again during the last eighteen years of his life, (1848–1866,) which he devoted chiefly to Oriental literature. Extended studies of Homer, various translations of Greek tragedies and comedies, complete translations of Theocritus and Horace, with numerous annotations in which the laws of meter and rhythm are especially discussed, critical emendations and poetic elaborations of the Minnesingers, whose songs he regarded as superior to the lyrics of Alcæus and Anacreon, and inferior only to those of Goethe, are a few of the fruits of his scholarly labors during these two periods. Still it was to Persian, Arabic, and Sanscrit that he directed his principal energies, and showed not only in his Hariri but also in many other poems,

> "Wie Poesie und Philologie einander zu fördern
> Und zu ergänzen vermag."

In his efforts to make poesy and philology thus mutually promote and supplement each other, Rückert enriched German literature with the most varied and graceful forms of versification and rhyme. From the Arabian Hariri he borrowed the *makame*, in which meter he relates the adventures and metamorphoses of Abu Seid of Serug; from the Persian Dschelaleddiar he took the *ghasel*, a poem standing between the epigram and the lyric, and consisting of an indefinite number of couplets, of which the two lines composing the first couplet rhyme with the last line of all the subsequent couplets, the fundamental tone or trait being, according to Platen, "ein schelmisches Getändel," a genial flattery or waggish dilettanteism. In "Nal und Damajanti" (an episode of the great epos, the Mahabharata) he introduced the Sanscrit *sloka* and successfully engrafted this scion of the Banyan forest upon the Hercynian oak; in "Rostem und Suhrab" and "Weisheit des Brahmanen" he naturalized the Alexandrine; in "Edelstein und Perle," and "Flor und Blankflor" he gave admirable specimens of the iambic tiercet, and in other poems he made nearly every form of Oriental and Occidental versification (even the peculiar measure of the Chinese *Tshi-kin*) familiar to the German ear. In these respects there is no poet of modern times so rich and many-sided as Rückert. But this affluence and facility brought their own perils with them. It cannot be denied, even by his most enthusiastic admirers, that many of his productions are exceedingly feeble in conception and commonplace in thought, and hardly worthy of a third-rate poetaster. A man who gives expression to all his ideas and emotions in rhyme will

inevitably be the author of a multitude of effusions which look like poetry at a distance, but on closer examination prove to be unilluminated by the faintest spark of inspiration. This was pre-eminently the fatality of Rückert. As he says of himself,

> "Mehr als Blumen im Gefilde sprossen
> Lieder täglich unter meiner Feder."

Every event of his external or internal life, every impression, whether derived from observation or from study, touched the chords of his soul as musically as the breeze touches the Æolian harp, and transformed itself into song. Too frequently, also, the results resembled the tones of an Æolian harp in being melodious and empty sounds and nothing more.

> "Darum muss der Reim sie ketten,
> Weil sie sonst kein Wesen hätten,
> Würde nicht der Schein es retten,"

is Rücket's own apology for his rhymed platitudes.

Notwithstanding the vigor and fire of Rückert's patriotic songs, and the imperishable charm of a portion of the "Liebesfrühling," we cannot agree with Dr. Beyer in according to him the character of a "Lyriker im vollsten sinne des Wortes." His genius is pre-eminently didactic, if genius can be regarded as at all essential to, or consistent with, the cultivation of this species of poetry. This inborn tendency to speculation, intensified by the powerful influence which Hegelianism exerted upon all provinces of thought during the the third and fourth decades of the present century, shows itself in all Rücket's writings and culminates in his "Wisdom of the Brahman," a poem consisting of a series of slightly connected monologues in which the most prominent schools of philosophy and systems of theosophy that have prevailed among different nations in different centuries are interpreted and criticized. The same element of reflection and instruction enters so largely into his dramas as to deprive them of every thing like dramatic unity and development and reduce them to a mere philosophy of history in dialogue, or, as regards the artistic form, to a sort of literary oratorio, so predominant is the musical expression in them. In like manner his epics are legendary and idyllic rather than truly objective and heroic, and seem to exist less in and for themselves than for the sake of inculcating moral truths or unfolding philosophic principles. In fact, the pedagogue is prominent in all his productions, and in very many of them entirely overshadows the poet. From this point of view Dr. Beyer is certainly justified in claiming

for Rückert the title of *Præceptor Germaniæ* in a broader sense than it can be applied to any other German author or teacher, not excepting Melanchthon.

Geschichte der Kirchlichen Armenpflege. (History of Ecclesiastical Charity.) Von GEORGE RATZINGER. 8vo., pp. xiv., 433. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder. 1868.

The ministrations of the Roman Catholic Church to the needy in all ages have received the highest encomiums of Protestants and political economists, and the author of this work, who is one of that body, renders a general service in portraying fully, and, we believe, impartially, the history of the charitable ministrations of his Church. He does not rely merely upon his co-religionists for authority, but has recourse to any that can furnish him support or light in his inquiries. Neander and Chalmers mix in friendly intercourse with Hefele, Döllinger, and Dupanloup, while our American Carey is allowed to expound his Protectionism.

The Romans, with all their culture, paid no attention whatever to the needy. In all pagan countries man, as such, had no rights except those which the bare letter of the law gave him, so that whole classes were really deprived of all claim upon the consideration of their fellow-men. The idea of *manhood* was totally wanting in heathendom, and even the noblest minds of antiquity were never able to attain to the pure ideas of humanity. We do not find them arrayed against the crimes of slavery, murder, or infanticide. There was no heart, no feeling for the sufferings of others. The maxim of Plautus expresses the heartlessness of all rich Romans: "He who gives food or drink to the beggar gets but little thanks; for he not only loses what he gives, but prolongs the poor man's wretched life." The whole Roman kingdom possessed no elements on which it was possible to build a care or love for the needy, for the Roman religion itself was the very fountain of immorality and human hatred. Domestic life was utterly corrupt, and destitute of love and feeling, and this was the cause of the general neglect of the poor. When Christianity came, a new element was added to the life and thinking of the world. Slavery was at that time every-where predominant, and no Roman was regarded respectable who was not a slave-holder. Now, Christianity addressed itself at once to all these social abuses; but it found slavery the hardest evil to eradicate. Many of the Church Fathers wrote directly against it. Chrysostom demanded of all slave-holders in the Christian Church to retain but two for personal service in the household, and to give all the rest which

they might own the privilege of learning a trade and living from it in later life. He indulged the secret thought of transforming slavery into a system of free manual labor, and thus gradually bringing all the slaves out of their bonds. The Gallic bishops required all slave-holders to release one of every ten from bondage. Even Gregory the Great wrote the noble sentiment: "It is a saving thought to restore their original freedom to men whom nature has made free, and whom man has deprived of their rights, and burdened them with the yoke of slavery." The efforts for the alleviation and extirpation of slavery met with inveterate opposition in England, perhaps even greater than anywhere else. Though the Council of London prohibited, A. D. 1112, the traffic in slaves, its decrees proved futile. Unscrupulous poor parents still sold their children to Ireland, and so extensive was the trade that in 1171 the Irish Synod of Armagh prohibited the buying and selling of English children, and declared that all English slaves in Ireland were free.

During the period down to the Reformation a multitude of institutions was organized for the relief of the needy. But a long time of inactivity now succeeded, and it was only at the beginning of the nineteenth century that charity again increased, and now gives evidence of approaching the early Christian example. All the German countries have introduced the English system of committing the poor largely to the care of the State—a system which, says the author, is fraught with evil to the State and neglect to the needy. We think that Protestants might gain some good ideas from the principles which Dr. Ratzinger lays down for the observance of all Catholics in the distribution of their charity. That each parish take special care of its own poor; that the pastor superintend the distribution of the poor fund; that religious pastoral care be always associated with the distribution of alms; that there always be unity in almsgiving, but wise distribution of labor; that all classes of the parish poor be supported; that charity be bestowed in necessary articles, such as clothing, implements for work, etc.; that, in bestowing alms, heed must be taken lest the self-respect of the beneficiaries be destroyed.

In giving this abstract of the work, we have already intimated its outline, which is as follows: Introduction, Part I., Christian Antiquity: 1. The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age; 2. The Age of Persecutions; 3. The Patristic Age. Part II., The Middle Ages: 1. The Carlovingian Age; 2. From the Carlovingians

to the Hohenstaufens; 3. From the Hohenstaufens to the Reformation. Part III, The New Period: 1. The Church and Charity; 2. Civil Charity; 3. Organization of Ecclesiastical Charity in the Future. Dr. Ratzinger leaves the Protestant Church altogether out of consideration, though he confesses the great service which Protestantism has rendered in this direction. He especially commends the great institutions of Dr. Wichern, of the Rough House, near Hamburgh, and promises to treat Protestant charity in a separate work at an early date. We shall await with interest the fulfillment of his promise.

Gott, Welt, und Mensch. Grundlinien der Religionswissenschaft in ihrer neuen Stellung und Gestaltung systematisch dargelegt. (God, the World, and Man. Outlines of the Science of Religion in its new Position and Form, Systematically Expounded.) Von EDWARD BALTZER. 8vo., pp. viii, 504. Nordhausen: F. Förstemann. 1869.

The author is one of the veteran leaders of the Free Congregations of Germany, that class of religious organizations which began in 1841 by casting off the doctrines sanctioned by the symbolical books, by cutting loose from the supervision and guidance of the State Church, and establishing their own rites, doctrines, and ecclesiastical polity. The members call themselves Protestant Friends, but received from their enemies the *sobriquet* of Friends of Light. Pastor Baltzer, in this last fruit of his prolific pen, adheres faithfully to the principles which he advocated twenty-five years ago, for he contends as fearlessly as ever for perfect religious liberty, and for the overthrow of all confessional restraint and ecclesiastical discipline. His work is divided as follows: Introduction. I. The Doctrine of the Beautiful. II. The Doctrine of the View of the World. III. The Doctrine of Self-Knowledge. IV. The Doctrine of Morals. V. The Doctrine of Art. VI. The Doctrine of Labor. The section on labor abounds in facts which would be of interest to general readers in England and America, where the discussions on society, and especially the laboring classes, have become so animated of late. The present age is a time of contradictions, the author contends, and many are asking, What is religion? but without receiving a satisfactory reply. The individual may appeal to his conscience, and yet his conscience may err. Now, he should purify and sharpen his *conscientiousness*, and this he can only do by science, by a perception of the truth. Materialism, however, must not be understood as a science. Religion does not consist in the feeling, with Schleiermacher, nor in idea, nor in knowledge, nor in desire, nor in capa

city, nor in devotion, nor in history, nor in the past, nor in the present, *but in the deed, in doing something.* But the religious element must have free scope, and hence Church government must be cast to the winds, for it contradicts the very essence of the religion of Jesus, and assumes Papal power, therefore being political, and not religious. One of the great problems of the times is the development of the science of religion, which is not one science among others, but that which embraces all else, every thing that deserves the name of science. All material for the science of religion falls under six points of view:

I. *Feeling*—Esthetics, the Doctrine of the Beautiful.
II. *Notion*—Dogmatics, the Doctrine of the View of the World.
III. *Thinking*—Philosophy, the Doctrine of Self-Knowledge.
IV. *The Will*—Ethics, the Doctrine of Morals.
V. *Power*—Artistics, the Doctrine of Art.
VI. *Doing*—Biology, the Doctrine of Labor.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection. A Series of Essays. By ALFRED WALLACE, Author of "The Malay Archipelago," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 384. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1870.

The "contributions to the theory" thus modestly offered were, some of them, published by Mr. Wallace in a scientific periodical before the theory itself had been given by Mr. Darwin to the world. Mr. Wallace, as we have stated in a former Quarterly, had in some degree anticipated Darwin, and his independent incursions into the field startled the great theorist into a premature publication. Yet in the present volume Mr. Wallace is particularly delicate to disclaim more than his own due, and is jealous lest a single fiber of Darwin's laurels should perchance seem to bind his own brow. In this volume, as in his "Malay Archipelago," lately by us reviewed, Mr. Wallace impresses us with his eminently conscientious candor.

A large share of the book is devoted to the curious subject of protective resemblances in the animal world. A species of beetle may so resemble the bark of the tree on which it holds its residence that it escapes destruction by its invisibility. Large numbers of animal species survive and permanently exist by this deceptive protection. Tristam, in his work on the ornithology of North Africa, is quoted as saying: "In the desert, where neither trees, brush-wood, nor even undulation of the surface afford the slight-

est protection from its foes, a modification of color which shall be assimilated to that of the surrounding country is absolutely necessary. Hence, *without exception*, the upper plumage of *every bird*, whether lark, chat, sylvain, or sand-grouse, and also the fur of *all the smaller mammals*, and the skin of *all the snakes and lizards*, is of one uniform Isabeline or sand color."—P. 50. The inference is that every species wanting this protection has perished, and we have a demonstration, it is argued, of Natural Selection, or the "survival of the fittest." Mr. Wallace traces this interesting subject through a great variety of resemblance in various parts of the world. It leaves the impression that, in a great number of instances, species do permanently exist by favor of special conditions; a conclusion probable and curious enough in itself, and very corroborative in its effect; but falling short, perhaps, of universality of application.

In his "Theory of Birds' Nests," Mr. Wallace maintains that birds build no more by mere instinct than man does. He assumes to prove that birds even learn to sing their particular notes, not from the inward promptings and shapings of the vocality, but from imitation of the parent note. Birds sing the song they are first habituated to hear; and if it be the tune of some other species, then their form will belong to one kind and their song to another! In a similar way birds *learn* to build. The same species build with different materials and in a different manner under different conditions. They improve in their style of building. On the other hand man builds also by imitation, according to necessities and conditions. On the whole, according to Mr. Wallace, the bird mind and the human mind differ not in the nature but in the range of their faculties. There is much to which we incline to demur in this ingenious chapter.

Mr. Wallace next gives an extended reply to the Duke of Argyll's argument in behalf of creation by Omnipotence in accordance with Law. He states the six Darwinian laws, (which are, indeed, but the simple statement of well-known facts,) which we may give as follows: *First*, All species tend to increase by propagation in a geometrical ratio; yet, *Second*, each species is in fact so limited by immense destructions as to remain stationary in actual number. *Third*, each species tends to produce its own likeness; yet, *Fourth*, this likeness always admits of a degree, more or less, of individual variation. *Fifth*, when a variation is disadvantageous, the individual or species perishes in the struggle for existence, and leaves none but the best adapted for survival.

Sixth, geological changes are constantly introducing new conditions, and so both destroying old species and tending to increase the amount of variation. Thus by a few well-ascertained permanent *facts*, formulated into *laws*, Mr. Wallace thinks that all the varieties of life are solved, and many facts are found which no other theory will explain. These six laws are indeed not primitive. Back of them you might assign a divine Law-giver. But, as he thinks, Herbert Spencer has shown in his "First Principles" and his "Biology" that all these so-called Laws may be but the simple necessary "results of the very nature of life, and of the essential properties of organized and unorganized matter."

I believe that the universe is so constituted as to be self-regulating; that, as long as it contains life, the forms under which that life is manifested have each a coherent power of adjustment to each other and to surrounding nature; and that this adjustment necessarily leads to the greatest amount of variety and beauty and enjoyment, because it does depend on general laws and not on a continual supervision and re-arrangement of details. As a matter of feeling and religion, I hold this to be a far higher conception of the Creator and of the Universe than that which may be called the "continual interference" hypothesis: but it is not a question to be decided by our feelings or convictions, it is a question of facts and of reason. Could the change which Geology shows us has ever taken place in the forms of life have been produced by general laws, or does it imperatively require the incessant supervision of a creative mind?—P. 268.

Mr. Wallace, like most reasoners of his class, is very anxious to save trouble to the Infinite. God, in his view, may be able to take care of large things, but cannot afford to notice small things. He might, perhaps, be allowed to regulate the orrery of the universe revealed to us by the telescope, but not the infinite littleness suggested by the microscope. We are not told how big an article must be in order to be visible to Omniscience. We are not told how much nearer to infinity a planet is than an animalcule. Such a reasoner seems not to realize that under color of honoring he is truly degrading the Deity. God is absolutely perfect in the infinitely little as in the infinitely great; equally wonderful in both universes. Under color of excusing God from trouble, such reasoners ever first excuse God from all care for the universe, and then from all existence in it. It is the first pious and respectful step toward Atheism.

Yet man, Mr. Wallace maintains, has by the power of reason risen largely above the power of external conditions, and so *above the law of Natural Selection*. An animal or species overtaken with a slight defect perishes in the struggle for existence. But man by protective inventions and by mutual social aids defies to a great degree the consequences of special disadvantages. In the

geologic ages, before man had attained under special favorable conditions the powers of reason, though probably possessed of nearly his present form, he was developed into the different races in which he now is found. A specialization into races cannot take place after the fully rational period has commenced, and man has become able to resist the specializing influences.

But in man Mr. Wallace also discovers original characteristics for which Natural Selection cannot account, and which bear the marks of Overruling Design. He goes through a striking demonstration to show that savage man has a larger brain than Natural Selection can allow, requiring a primitive endowment. So the hairless skin, the peculiarities of the human hand, and the powerful moral intuitions which Mr. Wallace's ample experience among uncivilized races has enabled him there to trace, are all traits above the power of Mr. Darwin's theory to explain. In man, then, Mr. Wallace recognizes specialty, supremacy, and overruling purpose. After such concessions, what becomes of the outcry against "special creation?" Why not have done with it, and allow man, in the noble language of the primitive document, to have been "created in the image of God?"

Mr. Wallace revolts, too, quite erectly, against the Atheistic conclusions with which second-rate reasoners have endeavored to overlay Darwin. He revolts, too, against Mr. Huxley's "protoplastic" materialism. Matter, moreover, he believes not to be constituted of ultimate particles. What have generally been considered to be "atoms," he holds to be infinitely minute "centers of force;" so that all matter is *force;* and of this *force* the cause and basis are the divine volition; so that in the entire system and movement of things the divine will is immanent. If so, then, we think each "center of force" is a "special creation;" and so is each "variation in species," and so is every definite form of species. Every movement of every ultimate "center of force" requires a movement of divine volition. Instead of being "self-regulating," "the universe" is regulated at each infinitesimal step; and that "inherent power of self-adjustment" is the immanent God adjusting every part and particle. God ceases to be that infinitely lazy Turpitude which the savans would make of him, and is ever working with equal wonderfulness in the infinitely great and throughout the infinitely minute. Doubtless, an infinite and eternal Being would persistently act with a free uniformity according to the Law of wisdom. And it is that uniformity which unwise men use to abolish God and establish Atheism.

Miracles Past and Present. By WILLIAM MOUNTFORD. 12mo., pp. 512. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1870.

Critics who represent Mr. Mountford's work as merely an appropriation of modern so-called "Spiritualism" to the uses of a supernatural philosophy and religion, misstate the scope of his arguments. There are but two or three chapters treating of the Spiritualistic phenomena, and those might be cut out of his book without materially affecting its results. His position, more extendedly, is, that there is a large body of supernatural narrative, too well authenticated by rational evidence to be rationally rejected. He agrees with Henry More, Wesley, Dr. Bushnell, and others, that supernatural manifestations, the projection of superhuman agencies into our human sphere, so far from being, in accordance with Hume, *contrary to experience*, are verified by thousands of recorded and constantly occurring experiences. It is a most vicious circle to maintain that supernaturalism is contrary to experience by rejecting every experience that is a supernaturalism. Nor is it just or logical to say, that if you admit the truth of any modern narrative of the supernatural you must admit the whole body of superstitious marvels; for all history and all narrative must be tested by a discriminating criticism, eliminating fiction from truth; and when these narratives are so tested, there is an immense residuum which is rejected not by the fair reason, but by the persistent *will* of the skeptic. Mr. Mountford maintains that Protestant theologians, compelled, as they fancied, to reject the miracles of Popery, have fearfully played into the hands of infidelity by so strenuously denying the validity of evidence as to shake the credibility of the Scripture miracles; but to the Papist he would reply by admitting any duly authenticated Catholic supernaturalism, and then showing quite as good and quite as numerous miracles among Protestants. Sporadic supernaturalisms, in countless numbers, occurred among the pagans. They are occurring every day, among the religious and the irreligious, in the form of dreams, second sight, presentiments, etc., sometimes carefully concealed in silence for fear of ridicule, sometimes circumstantially narrated in our secular newspapers.

How then can miracles be specially adduced in favor of Christianity? We are not quite sure that we coincide with Mr. Mountford in our answer to this question. His chapter on the definition of a miracle, we think, runs astray. He gives the term miracle, as is often done, to *all* supernaturalisms, whereas we

would limit the term in a strict sense to a particular kind, namely, to *a supernaturalism visibly originated and performed at the will of a visible agent in attestation of a religious truth, system, or mission.* A supernaturalism, like a dream or a presentiment, *coming upon* a man from an unseen source, rather than performed voluntarily by him, is no miracle. Miracles, therefore, are in fact mostly limited to Scripture history. Moses performed one miracle of larger physical magnitude than any one performed by Christ; but his miracles were specifically limited and prescribed to him. *Christ alone appears to be full master of all miraculous power at will.* He stands *alone* in the attitude of claiming and wielding at pleasure any power he pleases in proof of his supreme identification with God himself. The human system, the elements, the gates of death and hades, nay, the powers of hell, submit to his sway and volition. He stands, therefore, without a rival; and when we superadd the identification of his divine person by antecedent prophecy, the majesty of his Personality as it presents itself in the Gospel picture, and the wonderful effects of his life on human history, it is absurd to bring any supernaturalism, however clear its reality, into competition with his divine supremacy. Quite the reverse. Every other visible manifestation of the supernatural serves to remove the presupposition against miracle, and especially against the supreme miracle of Christ claiming to be God-man.

Many Protestant theologians deny all modern or extra-scriptural supernaturalism, not only from fear of Papal miracles, but because their views of "an intermediate state" are in danger of being contradicted. Those who deny an intermediate state can scarce admit a message from a disembodied spirit. Others fear a contradiction to their particular views of the conditions of the intermediate state. We entertain neither of these fears. That there is an intermediate state, that there may occur conditions under which a spirit in that state may make communications, true or false, to a living individual possessing the proper predisposition, is to our view uncontradicted by Scripture. Nor have we met with any tolerably authenticated narrative of the kind that at all disturbed our theology.

The inquirer into this subject will find many a solution of old difficulties in Mr. Mountford's work, expressed in a very pleasant style. There are, indeed, some waste paragraphs and chapters. His Unitarian theology prevents his placing Christ in his full, sole, Divine Majesty, and so weakens his argument. To those predisposed to his views his book will be an acceptable sup-

plement to Jung Stilling's Theory of Pneumatology, with its mixture of truth and error; to Delitzsch's Biblical Psychology, and to Mr. M'Donald's book on Spiritualism, published at our Book Rooms.

Maternity. A popular Treatise for Wives and Mothers. By TULLIO SUZZARDI VERDI, of Washington, D.C. 12mo., pp. 451. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 1870.

No creature is brought up in so studied an ignorance to the last moment of the duties of its futurity as the young girl destined to be a mother. Our wonder is not that so many human beings die in infancy, but that the human race has survived. Civilization, however, has arrived at that point in which one remedy is attainable. A manual furnished by a competent professional hand can be put in her possession as soon as she becomes a wife. Anxieties, fearful mistakes, and remediless disasters may be prevented by such a method. The present volume comes from an eminent homeopathic *savant*, and is doubtless clothed with professional authority.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Our Oriental Missions. Volume I. India and China. Volume II. China and Bulgaria. By EDWARD THOMSON, D.D., LL.D., Late Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author. Pp. 267, 281. Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden. New York: Carlton and Lanahan. 1870.

With the utmost modesty Bishop Thomson claims in the preface of these volumes to furnish only "substantially a Journal," kept by him during his visit to the East in the years 1864-65 with the view of a suitable report to the Church of the condition of its Oriental mission work. Had he been premonished of his departure to be with Christ, and had he sought with the greatest care for words which, as the charge of a dying Christian Bishop, should point out the way of both duty and victory, and so live long after he had gone, he could hardly have found any better adapted to inspire the Church to arise and possess the world for its Lord than are contained in some of these chapters.

A mere record of travel in those lands, now so full of a daily increasing interest, prepared by so keen an observer, would have been of great value, just as it would have been a rare privilege, with him as a companion, to look upon the wonderful beauty of the Taj Mahal, to explore the temples and shrines of holy Benares, to sit and think of Chrysostom in St. Sophia, or ride by railway into Ephesus. Nothing worth seeing escapes his eyes, and terse sentences comprise the wealth of an ordinary page. Indeed, one

sometimes wishes for a greater fullness of description, until it becomes apparent that the author only hastens on to grander fields and higher themes. He went abroad upon the duty of examining the several mission fields of his own Church. This duty he fulfilled thoroughly and conscientiously, visiting every station and personally observing its condition. Facts as he found them are detailed briefly but sufficiently. The address given to the missionaries at the time of the organization of the India Mission Conference, while full of sympathy for the little band, and eloquent beyond the speech that often falls upon human ears, shows him to have mastered the whole problem of religion in India. He could not conceive his duty to be done without an exhibition of the relation of Christianity to the religious systems and the entire round of circumstances in that country, and to this we are indebted for the chapters entitled "General Remarks on India," and "Our Field in India," than which it is doubtful if a more brilliant and comprehensive presentation of the subject has ever been made. Though the latter is limited in its application, no friend of missions can examine either of them without delight.

In the same way the field in China was explored, its peculiarities described, its religious systems examined and found ready to perish, and the advantages of the country for missionary work are presented in an essay of some twenty pages. Then we have the return journey to Constantinople and a visit to the missions in Turkey, but details respecting them give place to the graver inquiries which arise in the presence of the Christianity of Western Asia and Eastern Europe. The Greek, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, Abyssinian, Maronite and Nestorian Churches, fallen but nevertheless Christian, still firmly hold the essential doctrines of the Gospel, though combining with them a literature and practice unfavorable to spiritual life. The facts thus furnished are essential to a full apprehension of the relation of Christianity to the greater field of the whole world, to the consideration of which the reader is next invited. The comparison of Christianity with Mohammedism, Brahminism, and Buddhism, the religions of 630,000,000 of souls, in the respects of civilization, theology, morals, and salvation, full as is its truth and profound as is its thought, is only preparative to a view of the condition and prospects of the Church of Christ. It is no less true than startling to those whose investigations have not been directed toward it, that Christianity numbers more believers than any other faith, controls thirty forty-ninths of the earth's surface,

and has under its scepter politically more than one half of the race. The intelligence, the wealth, and the power of the globe are in Christian hands. There is also an increasing disposition to propagate the faith, and with it increased facilities, so that, using the means at its command, the Church should look for the conversion of the world before the close of the twentieth century.

Our outline can convey no idea of the clear thought, careful analysis, deep penetration, and beautiful style of these volumes. They are unsurpassed in our missionary literature. They breathe throughout the spirit of the loftiest faith in the coming triumph of the Church—the spirit which, when it once prevades its mighty hosts, will render them irresistible and bring near the promised day of victory.

D. A. W.

Round the World: A Series of Letters by CALVIN KINGSLEY, D.D., late Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Vol. I., Europe and America. Vol. II., Asia. 12mo, pp. 344, 325. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

The stalwart figure, dark eye, and mellow voice of Bishop Kingsley will not soon fade from the memory of the Church. His was a most manly Christian life. His history leaves some memorable points. He was, like Asbury, a pioneer Bishop; not a pioneer over solely the American soil, but an episcopal pioneer "around the world." He has erected his memento on the soil of Asia; a token that Asia is to be conquered to Christ. And these two beautiful volumes will be as seed sown in the heart of the Church to bring forth manifold fruits.

Bishop Kingsley's style is like his character—clear, vigorous, solid, realistic. His pages are not variegated with the hues of fancy. There is little of rhetorical rhythm in his periods. His record around the world stands in curious contrast with the pages of the sensational traveler who must make every clause of every sentence flashing and thrilling lest his book fail to fix the reader and so to gain the purchaser. He assumes a practical and rational interest on the part of his reader, and repays it with truth. We hope that thousands will travel with him over his route around the globe, and that the light his career has thrown over the field of the world will bring it more clearly under the eye of the Church, and contribute to the formation of a new era in our missionary work.

We are specially interested with his survey of the two great Asiatic fields, China and India. The effect on his own mind was evidently a practical increase of his faith in Christianity. His

descriptions of the utter debasement of the people, especially in the Chinese cities, is at once humorous and appalling. For that degradation the Gospel is the true and surely coming remedy. The Chinese, he says, are

An ignorant people compared with Protestant Christian nations, and a degraded people; yet they esteem all but themselves barbarians. But it is characteristic of poor human nature to assume to possess in extraordinary measure the very thing it lacks. If the Gospel can bring this people to a level with Christian civilization, and should make no more difference in their favor in the world to come than it does in this world, there will be motives strong enough to urge the entire Christian Church in earnest Christian effort in their behalf.

The Asiatic superstitions, he finds, are in themselves fading away:

It is easy to see that both Hindoo idolatry and Mohammedanism are losing their hold on the minds of those who still show them an outward deference. I have talked with intelligent Hindoos, with the red paint on their foreheads, indicating that they had faithfully attended to their religious rights, who, nevertheless, told me they had no faith in these mummeries, and felt the heathen yoke that was upon them an intolerable burden; deploring caste, and mourning over the degraded condition of their women. They will do utter violence to their doctrine of caste when it can be done without exposure. I speak now of many of the more intelligent among them. Mohammedans have made similar confessions to me, saying they felt at liberty, so far as any conscientious scruples were concerned, to violate the requirements of that religion. Besides all this, there seems to be a sort of foreboding in regard to many particulars that their ancient religion is about worn out. One is, that after about thirty years more the sacred Ganges will lose its virtue. The day is dawning on India. May the Sun of Righteousness, with healing in his beams, soon rise upon her!

Christianity in its entire spirit is more happy than heathenism:

Without witnessing it, one cannot realize what a difference there is in the entire mental and moral atmosphere between a heathen and a Christian country. While one is bright, and cheerful, and hopeful, and warm, and enterprising, the other is dark, and dreary, and cold, and stagnant, and desponding. It revives the spirits, and gives new vigor and life to the whole man to return and see how Christianity moves the world; to feel its warm sympathy and breathe its heavenly atmosphere.

Free Russia. By HEPWORTH DIXON, Author of "Free America," "Her Majesty's Tower," etc. 12mo., pp. 359. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Were Hepworth Dixon as reliable as he is readable, his book would be a valuable contribution to our political literature. But his "Free Russia" is but too suitable a companion to his "Free America," basing large pretensions of knowledge upon very slight observation, and substituting the sensational for the accurate. The present work is precisely what one might expect from a tourist who could report to Europe that our Shaker settlements exert a large influence on the public mind of the United States.

The following paragraph, however, is, we fear, but too accurate; and it furnishes to our own sensational classes a fair warning of the probable results of the enormous prevalence of fashionable

card-playing among ourselves. Let but the *amusement* get full establishment, and the *gambling* will duly follow:

> Next to rye bread and salt-fish, saints and cards are the articles mostly bought and sold, for in Russia every body prays and plays: the noble in his club, the dealer at his shop, the boatman on his barge, the pilgrim by his way-side cross. The propensities to pray and gamble may be traced to a common root: a kind of moral *fetichism*, a trust in the grace of things unseen, in the merit of dead men, and even in the power of chance. A Russian takes, like a child, to every strange thing, and prides himself on the completeness of his faith. When he is not kneeling to his angel, nothing renders him so happy as the sight of a pack of cards. Nearly every one plays high for his means; and nothing is more common than for a burgher to stake and lose, first his money, then his boots, his cap, his *caftan*, every scrap of his garments, down to his very shirt. Whisky excepted, nothing drives a Russian to the devil so quickly as a pack of cards. But see these gamblers throw down their cards, unbonnet their heads, and fall upon their knees. The priest is coming down the street with his sacred picture and his cross. It is market-day in the town, and he is going to open and bless some shop in the bazar; and fellows who were gambling for their shirts are now upon their knees in prayer.—Page 219.

The Prescott Memorial; or, a Genealogical Memoir of the Prescott Families in America. In two parts. By WILLIAM PRESCOTT, M.D. Green and gilt, 8vo., pp. 653. Boston: Dutton & Son. 1870.

The venerable Dr. Prescott of Concord, the honored friend of the late Dr. Wilbur Fisk, and founder of the "Prescott Cabinet," at the Wesleyan University, is here the memorialist of the Prescott families of America. Besides the frontispiece likeness of the author there are several other fine engravings, including that of the eminently intellectual face of the celebrated historian. It is a beautiful volume externally; every way a worthy memento of the extensive *gens* of Prescotts.

The Rob Roy on the Jordan, Nile, Red Sea, and Genesareth, etc. A Canoe Cruise in Palestine and Egypt, and the Waters of Damascus. By J. MACGREGOR, M.A. With Maps and Illustrations.

Mr. Macgregor tells his story, first for Harper's Monthly, in the style of a rover, sensationally and graphically. But he writes also with the knowledge of a scholar and in the faith of a Christian. It is a book which the popular reader may run over with interest, and the biblical student consult for new information.

Educational.

A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language, in which its Forms are illustrated by those of Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Old Saxon, Old Friesic, Old Norse, and Old High German. By FRANCIS A. MARCH, Professor of the English Language and Comparative Philology in Lafayette College, etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 254. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

This work is an honor to American scholarship, a valuable text-book for use and reference. Lafayette takes the lead of American

colleges in the scientific study of the English language. This is our first college to set apart time and funds for the philosophical study of our mother-tongue, and to unite comparative philology with English in a professorship, which enables the student to avail himself of the chief researches of the great German masters of philology. Professor March has enthusiastically toiled in this field, long deemed a wilderness of rocks and thorns, and in this work shows how an earnest, loving scholar can make it bloom. He has largely entered into the labors of Grimm, Bopp, Curtius, Grein, and many other German scholars, but he has notwithstanding produced a work that is his own, learned but not dull, comprehensive yet clear, full of facts yet methodically arranged, so that the student can advance through the forest without bewilderment. As far as we know this is the first original American work upon the subject, the college text-book generally used being the little English manual of Vernon. This is a thorough philological grammar, giving not only facts but their philosophy, and opening up vistas of philological relation through all the great Indo-European family, from the Sanscrit to the Lithuanic.

But though the Anglo-Saxon be the mother-speech from which sprang the English of Chaucer and Shakspeare, our interest in it is a purely scientific interest. Its study is a linguistic paleontology. Its literature is *dead* in a sense in which the epithet cannot be applied to the literatures of Greece and Rome. Alfred is farther off from us than Julius Cæsar; Cædmon and Beowulf than Tacitus and Virgil. The rags and tatters of this worn-out language are reverently collected by enthusiastic philologists to find the threads from which our modern speech was woven, and that reverence and enthusiasm the student must share to enjoy this work of Professor March. N.

Pamphlets.

As Regards Protoplasm, in Relation to Professor Huxley's Essay on the Physical Basis of Life. By JAMES HUTCHINSON STIRLING, F.R.C.S., and LL.D. (Edin.) Pp. 70. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield & Co. 1870. (No. 3, University Series.)

It is a signal proof of the brilliant genius and eminent standing of Professor Huxley that in one fortnight he was able to instal the term PROTOPLASM among the key-words of the English language and to fill the higher mind of England with excitement at its alarming import. The excitement has spread to this country, and nearly all our Quarterlies have furnished an article subjecting

Mr. Huxley's performance to the tests of criticism. The performance was a lecture delivered by him in one of the principal towns of England, in which he professed to have furnished the demonstration, as the final word of science, clothed in drapery of most gorgeous rhetoric, of the non-existence of mind except as a property of matter. The "Physical basis of life" is a certain material substance known to science as Protoplasm; and all thought is but the molecular motion of the protoplastic particles. Stripped of all its variegated plumage of words and circumlocutions, the skeleton of the argument, according to our poor understanding, would be as follows—and if it is a very poor showing of logic we believe it to be no fault of ours:

Protoplasm, then, is demonstrably the "Physical basis of life" because it exists in all living beings, the one identical element, whether beings animal or vegetable, whether mosses or men. This Protoplasm consists chemically of the four elements, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. Now water is, we know, a compound of oxygen and hydrogen; and inasmuch as if you properly mix oxygen and hydrogen, and run an electric spark through them, you have *water*, so if you mix carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen under the influence of pre-existing protoplasm, you get *protoplasm*. Now when you thus get *water* you do not need to add to it verbally or mentally any such term or idea as *aquosity;* so when you thus get protoplasm you have no need to add any such word as *vitality*. All the properties of *aquosity* are embraced in the simple being of water; and all the properties of vitality (such as thought and voluntary motion) are embraced in the very being of protoplasm. In your cup you may hold a pint of water; in your fingers you may hold a pound of life.

To state this argument thus nakedly (and if you doubt the accuracy of our statement send twenty-five cents to Mr. Chatfield and he will send you a copy of the argument itself) is, if not to refute it, at least, we think, to show the absence of much need of refutation. It seems sufficient to say that there are immense quantities of *dead protoplasm*, but no such thing as *dry water*. If protoplasm is life, then lifeless protoplasm is lifeless life—that is, after you have got your protoplasm you need to have *vitality* added to it, just as you never need to add *aquosity* to water. Knock a man hard enough and you knock the *vitality* out of him, but not the protoplasm. The universality of protoplasm in all living organisms only proves that it is one of the necessary *conditions* of the visible manifestation of life in our physical world; it

does not prove it to be one of the necessary conditions of the existence of life in the Universe. Mr. Huxley's performance has not, perhaps, helped the cause of materialism forward one infinitessimal step.

If we rightly recollect, Mr. Stirling is a Scotch clergyman, and this pamphlet was originally published as an article in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*. He is the author of a work entitled "The Secret of Hegel," which is said to be a profound exposition of the Hegelian philosophy. We query whether he is not the greatest metaphysician living. His present article we read with the same amazement at the affluence of its erudition and the masterly reach of its power that we experienced in first reading Sir William Hamilton's handling of Whately's Logic. One thing that surprises us is that, whereas the other answerers of Huxley have merely refuted his flimsy logic, Stirling has, with a giant scholarship and logic, riddled through and through his physiology, mastering the Professor on the very ground where he claims to be sole master. With his huge Scotch sledge-hammer he levels in shatters post after post of this physiological structure; and then with a razor of the finest edge makes a finish with the logic and metaphysics of protoplastic Mr. Huxley. But it is not enough to say that there is nothing left of the Professor but a malodorous grease-spot; Stirling's article is a signal positive gain. Its constructive value as a putting of the psychological argument is permanent. Mr. Huxley has conquered Spiritualism as Louis Napoleon conquered Germany, and Hutchinson Stirling is his Wilhelm.

The Catholic World. July, 1870.

This periodical is, we believe, edited by Father Hecker, and, being endorsed by the Pope himself, may be quoted as an unquestionable authority for Romanistic views and purposes. It is ably conducted and generally presents the attractive side of Catholicism with great skill.

The July number contains an article which presents the views and aims of American Catholicism so frankly that we conclude to place some extracts from it on record for the possible future use of some of our readers. It is entitled "The Catholic of the Nineteenth Century."

1. *The American Catholic is to wield his vote for the purpose of securing Catholic ascendancy in this country.*

An offer and promise are as distinctly made to the Catholics of this age as they were to the chosen people when released from the Egyptian bondage. A land of

promise, a land flowing with milk and honey, is spread out before them, and offered for their acceptance. The means placed at their disposal for securing the rich possession are not the sword nor wars of extermination waged against the enemies of their religion, but, instead, the mild, and peaceful influence of the ballot, directed by instructed Catholic conscience and enlightened Catholic intelligence.

2. *Legislation must be governed by the will of God unerringly indicated by the Pope.*

All legislation in harmony with the organic law is theocratic and divine; all in violation or opposition, precisely in the measure and degree of departure, unjust, cruel, tyrannical, false, vain, unstable, and weak, and not entitled to respect or obedience. Since justice and our honor and dignity require that we should obey God and not man, we are compelled by every reasonable motive to ascertain his will. He does not communicate personally and orally with creatures. . . . The Catholic Church is the medium and channel through which the will of God is expressed. The chain of communication, composed of the triple strand of revelation, inspiration, and faith, stretches underneath the billows of eternity to the shore of time, from the throne of God to the chair of Peter. The finger of the Pope, like the needle in the compass, invariably points to the pole of eternal truth, and the mind of the Sovereign Pontiff is as certain to reflect the mind and will of God as the mirror at one end of a submarine cable to indicate the electric signal made at the other.

3. *Education must be controlled by Catholic authorities; and under education the opinions of the individual and the utterances of the press are included, and wrong opinions are to be punished by the secular arm under authority of the Church, even to the extent of war and bloodshed.*

The difficult and vexed question of mixed education obtrudes itself upon our attention at every step of a discussion like the one in which we are engaged. It is not our purpose to enter upon its details at present. The chief pastors in solemn council assembled will undoubtedly decide upon the line of conduct most expedient for us to follow. . . . The supremacy asserted for the Church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate function of the censorship of ideas, and the right to examine and approve or disapprove all books, publications, writings, and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment, or entertainment, and the supervision of places of amusement. This is the principle upon which the Church has acted in handing over to the civil authority for punishment *criminals in the order of ideas.* It is the principle upon which every civilized government acts in emergencies, and it was asserted rigorously and unsparingly North and South during the recent revolution.

From all this we understand that the Romish spiritual power embraces in its scope also the temporal power; and thereby the Pope is the most absolute of all secular potentates. The American Catholic votes according to the decree and for the benefit of a foreign absolute sovereign. His oath to renounce all foreign jurisdiction is the most absolute perjury. He has, thence, no right to American citizenship. We also understand that when the secular arm has the power it is requirable by the Church to execute those who entertain views opposed to the Papacy; and that the only reason why the Church does not now require it is that the secular arm is not at the Pope's command. We finally understand that Catholics are ready and bound, when strong enough, to take

arms in behalf of these views and involve the country in conflicts as terrible as our late civil war. It is their weakness, not their will, that prevents.

Miscellaneous.

The Earth and its Wonders. In a series of Familiar Sketches. By Rev. CHARLES ADAMS, D.D. Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden.

A very successful attempt to invest science in graceful and popular style.

The Gospel of the Kingdom. A Kingdom not of this World, not in this World, but to come in the Heavenly Country; Of the Resurrection from the Dead, and of the Restitution of All Things. By SENIOR HARVARD. 8vo., pp. 463. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1870.

The Origin and Development of Religious Belief. By S. BARING GOULD, M.A., Author of "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," "The Silver Store," etc. Part I. Heathenism and Mosaism. Large 12mo., pp. 414. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

The Spirit of Life; or, Scripture Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost. By E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon. Large 12mo., pp. 192. London: Religious Tract Society.

Prophecy a Preparation for Christ. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the Year MDCCCLXIX, on the Bampton Foundation. By R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Large 12mo., pp. 397. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1870.

Sermons Preached at Brighton. By the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, the Incumbent of Trinity Chapel. With Portrait of the Author. New edition. Large 12mo., pp. 838. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The New Timothy. By WILLIAM M. BAKER. Author of "Inside," "Oak Mot," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 344. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Light-Houses and Light-Ships. A Descriptive and Historical Account of their Mode of Construction and Organization. By W. H. DAVENPORT ADAMS, Author of "Buried Cities of Campagnia," "Queen of the Adriatic," etc., with Illustrations from Photographs and other sources. 12mo., pp. 322. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of the Human Body. From the French of A. LE PILEUR, Doctor of Medicine. Illustrated by forty-five Engravings, by LEVÉILLÉ. 12mo., pp. 256. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The History of Hortense, Daughter of the Empress Josephine, Queen of Holland, Mother of Napoleon III. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT, Author of "The French Revolution," "History of Napoleon Bonaparte," etc., with Engravings. 12mo., pp. 379. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Anna Lavater. A Picture of Swiss Pastoral Life in the Last Century. By Rev. W. LIETHE, Pastor of the Parochial Church, Berlin. Translated from the German by CATHARINE E. HURST. 12mo., pp. 226. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The True Unity of Christ's Church. Being a Renewed Appeal to the Friends of the Redeemer on Primitive Christian Union and the History of its Corruption, to which is now added a Modified Plan for the Reunion of all Evangelical Churches embracing as Integral parts the World's Evangelical Alliance, with all its National Branches. By S. S. SCHMUCKER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 262. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1870.

The Monks Before Christ. Their Spirit and their History. By JOHN EDGAR JOHNSON. 12mo., pp. 144. Boston: A. Williams & Co. 1870.

The United States Internal Revenue and Tariff Laws. Passed July 13, 1870. Together with the Acts imposing Taxes on Distilled Spirits and Tobacco and for other Purposes, (approved July 20, 1868,) and such other Acts or Parts of Acts relating to Internal Revenue as are now in effect, with Tables of Taxes, a copious Analytical Index and full Sectional Notes. Compiled by HORACE E. DRESSLER. 12mo., pp. 99. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Saint Louis, the Future Great City of the World. Illustrated with a Map. By L. W. REAVIS. 8vo., pp. 106. St. Louis: Published by order of the St. Louis County Court. 1870.

The Whisky War in Adrian; or, the Trials and Triumphs of Prohibition in Lenawee County, Michigan. A Discourse delivered at the M. E. Church in Adrian, Michigan, July 17, 1870, by Rev. J. S. SMART. 12mo., pp. 33. Published and for sale by J. M. Arnold & Co., Detroit, Michigan.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada. By THOMAS WEBSTER. 12mo., pp. 424. Hamilton. 1870.

Recollections of Eton. By an Etonian. With Illustrations by Sydney P. Hall. 8vo., paper, pp. 126. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Annual Reports of the Officers of the Retreat for the Insane at Hartford, Connecticut. April, 1870. 12mo., pp. 35. Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Brainard.

A Memoir of Rev. Jacob Ward, a Local Elder in the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Rev. ALFRED BRUNSON, A.M., D.D. 16mo., pp. 20. La Crosse, Wis.: W. W. Ustick. 1870.

Speeches, Letters and Sayings of Charles Dickens. With Sketch of the Author by GEORGE AUGUSTUS SALA, and Sermon by DEAN STANLEY. 8vo., pp. 147. Paper cover. Harper and Brothers. 1870.

Charles Dickens. The Story of his Life by the Author of the "Life of Thackeray," with Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 110. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Fiction.

Veronica. A Novel. By the Author of "Aunt Margaret's Troubles." 12mo., pp. 175. New York, 1870.

The Genial Showman: being a Reminiscence of Artemus Ward, and Pictures of a Showman's Career in the Western World. By EDWARD P. HINGSTON. 12mo., pp. 155. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

True to Herself. A Romance. By F. W. ROBINSON, Author of "Stern Necessity," "Poor Humanity," etc. 8vo., paper, pp. 173. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Gwendoline's Harvest. A Novel. By the Author of "Carlyon's Year," "Found Dead," etc. 12mo., pp. 85. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Stern Necessity. A Novel. By T. W. ROBINSON. 12mo., pp. 154. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

So Runs the World Away. A Novel. By Mrs. A. C. STEEL, Author of "Gardenhurst." 12mo., pp. 145. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Kilmeny. By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "In Silk Attire," "Love or Marriage. 12mo., pp. 136. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

John. A Love Story. By Mrs. OLIPHANT, Author of "Agnes," "Carlingford," "The Minister's Wife," etc. 12mo., pp. 110. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The Writings of Anna Isabel Thackeray. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 425. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

INDEX.

Abbott, Jacob: The Juno Stories.....Page 483
Abbott, J. S. C.: The History of Hortense. 635
—— The Romance of Spanish History..... 149
Abbott, L.: Old Testament Shadows of New Testament Truths..... 161
Abbott, R.: The Young Detective..... 163
Adams, Dr.: The Earth and its Wonders.. 635
Adams, W.: Light-Houses and Light-Ships. 635
Alexander: Joseph Addison, Life of..... 152
Alone in London..... 162
American Annals of Deaf and Dumb..... 416
American Presbyterian Review...290, 455, 601
Andersson: In Spain, and a Visit to Portugal 483
Annual of Scientific Discovery, etc..... 470
Annual Reports, 45 and 46, of the Retreat for the Insane at Hartford, Conn..... 636
Architecture, Wonders of..... 473
Arnot: Life of James Hamilton, D.D., F.L.S. 322
Atonement of Jesus Christ—What is it?.... 159

Baker: The New Timothy..... 635
Baltzer: Gott, Welt, und Mensch, etc..... 619
Baptist Quarterly Review.....124, 290, 455, 601
Barclay: Apology for the True Christian Divinity, as held forth by the Quakers... 297
Barker: The Correlation of Physical and Vital Forces..... 477
Bazar Book of Decorum, The..... 483
Beck: Lehrbuchen der christlichen Glaubenslehre fur Kirche, Schule, und Haus... 406
Beecher: Principles of Domestic Science... 318
Beggar on Horseback, A, etc..... 162
Beneath the Wheels..... 484
Bercan Lessons for 1870, The..... 160
Beyer: Friedrich Rückert..... 613
Bible better than the Œcumenical Council. 84
"Liberal Church" notion exploded..... 84
General Councils divided and heterodox. 87
The Bible just what man needs..... 88
It embraces the grandest subjects..... 91
Claim of Councils to represent the Christian world absurd..... 94
Bible in the Public Schools, The..... 317
Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review. 290, 455, 601
Bibliotheca Sacra.....124, 291, 456, 601
Biekersteth: The Spirit of Life, etc....323, 635
Bierbower: Principles of Philosophy..... 307
Bill: A Winter in Florida, etc..... 159
Bird: The Black Man, etc..... 151
Bismarck, The Life of, etc..... 483
Black: Kilmeny..... 636
Bonar: Light and Truth, etc..... 322
Bound to John Company, etc..... 161
Boutwell: Arms and Armor in Antiquity and the Middle Ages..... 161
Bowen: American Political Economy..... 482
Brake Up: or, The Young Peace-makers.. 324
Brave Lady, A..... 484
British and Foreign Evangelical Review... 125, 292, 457, 602
British Quarterly Review.....128, 292, 602
Brooke: Sermons..... 137
Brown: Misread Passages of Scripture..... 136
—— The Divine Mysteries..... 135
Buck: Closing Scenes of the Life of Christ.. 136
Burns, Memoir of the Rev. Wm. C..... 322
Burr: Pater Mundi..... 486
Bushnell: Nature and the Supernatural, etc. 29

Catholic World, The..... 633
Christian Quarterly.....124, 290, 456, 601
Christ is Coming..... 162
Clarke: Institution for Deaf-Mutes, Reports. 416
Clark, R. W.: The Questions of the Hour: The Bible and the School Fund. Page 322
Clyde: Under Foot..... 324
Cocker: Christianity and Greek Philosophy. 490
Coleman, L.: The Apostolical and Primitive Church: Popular in its Government, Informal in its Worship..... 293
Comfort: A German Course..... 317
Coming of Christ in his Kingdom, etc..... 315
Congregational Quarterly..... 602
—— Review..... 602
Contributors, Notice to.....2, 324
Cooly: A Text-Book of Chemistry..... 162
Cowles: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, with Notes..... 482
Crane: Popular Amusements..... 152

D'Aubigne: History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin..... 151
Day: Two Reports on the Institutions for the Deaf and Dumb in Europe, etc.. 416
Deems and Carey: Hymns for all Christians 162
De Groot on Gnostic Testimonies to the New Testament..... 485
Basilides..... 486
Use of the Writings of the New Testament by Basilides..... 488
Use of the Writings of the New Testament among the oldest Gnostics..... 491
Use of the New Testament by Valentinus 494
Do the Citations from the Writings of the New Testament really proceed from the oldest Gnostics..... 503
Department of Public Instruction, Chicago. 324
De Pressensé: Rome and Italy, etc..... 293
—— The Early Years of Christianity..... 611
Des alten Nikolaus Hunnius Glaubens'chre der Evangelisch Lutherischen Kirche. 464
Dewart: Songs of Life, Poems..... 318
Dickens, Dialogues from..... 324
—— The Story of his Life, etc..... 636
Did the "Church South" Secede?..... 243
"Plan of Separation"..... 243
Report of the Committee of Nine on Division of the Church, Journal of General Conference, 1844..... 245
1. Adoption of Policy proposed by Report purely an Act of Grace on the part of the Northern Majority..... 247
2. This Report not a "Compact,"..... 248
3. The General Conference did not divide the Church..... 250
4. The General Conference created no Division—had no Power to Divide... 252
5. General Conference had no Intention, gave no consent, to divide the Church 253
6. Secession, violent or peaceful, a predetermined fact by the South.. 254
7. Act of Secession first committed by the Louisville Convention..... 257
8. "Plan of Separation" abundantly violated by the South in its boundaries.. 258
9. Assuming Report a "Compact," parties framing it mutually bound..... 259
10. Report enacted in case South separated, the M. E. Church to refrain from pastoral acts within given territory.. 260
Discipline of Alice Lee, The..... 163
Disraeli: Lothair..... 484
Dixon: Free Russia..... 629
Doomed City, The..... 163
Draper: History of American Civil War... 476
Dressler, Compiled by: The United States Internal Revenue and Tariff Law.... 636

Du Chaillu: Lost in the Jungle..... .Page 162
Duke of Argyle: Reign of Law..... 29

Eadie: Paul the Preacher, etc..... 137
Edinburgh Review.....126, 292 457, 603
Edwards: Debenham's Vow..... 484
—— Kitty..... 323
Eliot, George: Felix Holt, the Radical..... 162
—— Romola..... 163
—— The Mill on the Floss..... 162
Episcopal Visitation for 1870: Plan of..... 164
Ethics of Latin Comedy, The..... 562
Comedy a fine Setting for Ethics..... 563
Prevailing Notions of the Age..... 564
A Supreme Being recognized..... 564
Correctness of moral sentiment of Romans 568
A Broad Gulf between Theoretical and Practical Virtue..... 570
Evangelical Quarterly Review. ...124, 290, 602
Evans: The Christian Doctrine of Marriage. 697

Fault Finding.—Madeline Hascall's Letters 163
Finley: The Constitution of Man, etc..... 139
Fisher: Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, etc..... 298
Folsom: The Four Gospels..... 324
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 123, 288, 453
Belgium..... 455
France..... 454
Germany.....123, 288, 453
Foreign Religious Intelligence, 118, 285, 448, 598
Eastern Churches, The..... 121
Protestantism..... ...118, 288
Roman Catholicism..... .119, 285, 448, 598
Foster: New Cyclopædia of Illustrations... 463
Freedmen's Aid Society of the M. E. Ch.... 321
Free-will Baptist Quarterly.....124, 290
Froude: History of England, etc.....151, 322

Gallaudet: Methods of Instruction in Deaf and Dumb Institutions of Europe... 416
Garbett: The Dogmatic Faith, etc..... 133
General Conference of 1844..... 165
Slavery marked for "Extirpation"..... 165
Conservative Progressive Party..... 169
Dr. Elliott on a Slaveholding Bishop... 172
Quotation from Rev. W. A. Smith, of Va. 172
Four questions before the Conference.... 173
Was Bishop Andrew's case exceptional?. 174
Resolution requesting his resignation.... 177
Substitute to preceding resolution..... 179
"Compromise Law" on Slavery..... 182
Dr. Capers' Proposition..... 186
Glass-making in all Ages, Wonders of..... 473
Goddard: Baffled, etc..... 484
God is Love, etc..... 484
Godwin: Adventures of Caleb Williams.... 323
Goulbourn: The Pursuit of Holiness, etc... 162
Gould: The Origin and Development of Religious Belief..... 635
Gracey, S. L.: Anniversary Gems..... 323
Gray, J. C.: Topics for Teachers..... 324
Greenwood: Wild Sports of the World..... 162
Grey: Journal of a Visit to Egypt, etc..... 323
Gwendoline's Harvest..... 636

Hazenbach: History of the Church, etc.... 147
Hall: Health by Good Living..... 322
Hamilton: Sermons of R. Winter..... 296
Hanna: The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth..... 316
—— The Life of our Lord..... 464
—— The Ministry in Galilee..... 322
Harcourt: Rambles through the British Isles, etc..... 316
Harkness: Cæsar's Commentaries, etc..... 485
Hart: Removing Mountains, etc..... 322
Hartwig: The Polar World, etc..... 150
Harvard: The Gospel of the Kingdom..... 635
Haven: National Sermons..... 189
Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, etc.... Page 149
Hazard: Two Letters on Causation and Freedom in Willing..... 139
Heard: The Tripartite Nature of Man, etc. 306
Henderson: Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. 482
Himes: Some of the Methods and Results of Observation of the Total Eclipse of the Sun, Aug. 7, 1869..... 324
Hingston: The Genial Showman, etc.... . 636
Hirell..... 323
History of Methodism, An Appendix to Dr. Jacoby's new..... 265
Hitchcock's New Monthly Magazine..... 163
Holliday: Bible Hand-Book..... 137
Holy Scripture a Divine Revelation..... 45
Sufficient Proof for Believers..... 47
Innate Religion a Fiction..... 50
Scriptures Divinely Human..... 54
Objection that Scriptures do not Harmonize with recent Discoveries in Natural Science answered..... 61
The Scripture has Fulfil ed all it Promised 63
Home Influence..... 484
Home Life: How to make Home Happy... 322
Hood: Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets..... 162
How Charley Roberts became a Man..... 163
How Eva Roberts gained her Education.... 163
Human Body, Wonders of the..... 473

Inquiry into the Meaning and Aim of Matthew xxiv. 1-36..... 350
The stand-point of Jesus and his Disciples..... 350
The question, as the disciples intended it. 352
Its meaning, as they stated it..... 353
The answer of Jesus..... 354
"Take heed that no man deceive you."... 355
The signs of his coming foretold..... 360
Italian Art, Wonders of..... 473

Janvier: Agnes Morton's Trial, etc..... 322
Johnson: The Monks before Christ..... 635
Jones: Elements of the Hebrew Language.. 482
Josephus and Apion..... 274
Birth and education of Josephus..... 274
Conflict between Jews and Romans..... 275
Works of Josephus..... 277
Apion's attack upon the "Antiquities."... 277
—— His account of the origin of the Jewish sabbath..... 278
Josephus shows the absurdities of Apion. 278
Judd: Wesleyan University Records..... 139

Kellogg, Rev. E.: Elm Island Stories..... 483
—— The Boy Farmers of Elm Island..... 163
Kelly: Proverbs of all Nations..... 162
Kimmont: Household Stories..... 322
Kingsley: Round the World..... 638
Kitto's Bible Illustrations..... 137
Krummacher, Friedrich Wilhelm..... 161

Lane's Bibelwerk..... 297
Lange: Epistle of Paul to the Romans..... 130
Laurentie: L'Athéisme Scientifique..... 5
Lea: Studies in Church-History, etc..... 315
Letteris: The Hebrew Bible..... 299
Liethe: Anna Lavater..... 635
Life and Alone..... 483
Living Thoughts..... 162
London Quarterly Review.....128, 292, 457, 603
Lord, John: Ancient States and Empires... 161
Lord, J. L.: Jesus on the Throne of his Father David, etc..... 323
—— The Promise of Shiloh, etc..... 162
Lorimer: Among the Trees..... 162
Lyell: Principles of Geology..... 29
Lytton: The Odes and Epodes of Horace... 324

McCabe: Planting of the Wilderness, etc.. 163
McCarthy: My Enemy's Daughter..... 162

M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopædia....Page 463
M'Cosh: Laws of Discursive Thought, etc. 467
MacGregor, D.: Sheykh el of Israel, etc.... 162
MacGregor, J.: Rob Roy on the Jordan, etc. 630
March, F. A.: A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language, etc..... 630
M'Tyeire: A Manual of Discipline of the M. E. Church, South, etc..... 483
Marion and Jessie..... 484
Marshall: Sabbath Songs, etc..... 163
Marsh, G. P.: Man and Nature..... 299
Martineau: Essays, Philosophical, etc..... 29
Massachusetts Board of State Charities..... 416
Mathematics as an Educational Instrument. 65
Preliminary View..... 65
Mathematics Defined and Classified..... 66
The Mathematical Field Broad..... 71
Utility of its Practical Applications..... 72
Certain Objections to its Study Answered 74
Maunier: Book of Religious Instruction... 163
May: Dotty Dimple's Flyaway..... 163
Mercersburg Review.....124, 290, 602
Metcalf: Letter and Spirit..... 323
Methodist Hymn Book and its Associations 433
Plan of the Work..... 433
Instances of Want of Candor, etc..... 445
Meunier: Adventures on the Great Hunting Grounds of the World..... 163
Ministerial Transfers..... 235
Preachers restricted by Conferences..... 235
Transfers would Facilitate the Arrangement of Appointments..... 237
More extended Transfers would tend to Maintain the Unity of Methodism.... 237
Circulatory System favorable to the Development of the Men..... 240
Feasible Plan for Transfers..... 243
Minister, The Earnest vs. The Easy..... 397
Earnestness in Personal Piety the Basis. 399
Theological Schools..... 401
Pastoral Work..... 405
The Easy Minister described..... 409
His Preparations for the Pulpit..... 410
—— His Pastoral Work..... 412
Minutes of the Conferences for 1868-9..... 235
—— of First Ecum. Convention of the S. S. U. of the Baltimore Conference..... 163
Miss Van Kortland..... 484
Milford, The Life of Mary Russell..... 324
Mommsen's Rome.....148, 317, 323, 325, 488
Mommsen a follower of Niebuhr..... 327
Origin, Relationships, and Early Fortunes of the Primitive Races..... 329
Rome's Progress in the Arts of Life..... 333
Two Carthaginian Wars and other Wars. 340
Rome unable to govern itself..... 343
Roman treatment of Slave-laborers..... 345
Monk: Hymns, Ancient and Modern, etc... 162
Mounier, Marc: Wonders of Pompeii..... 323
Murray: Music-Hall Sermons..... 299
Muscovite and the Teuton, The..... 510
Controlling influence of the German element in Russian affairs..... 510
War between the German and Russian elements..... 511
German Diligence and Learning useful to Russia..... 513
Plan to Russianize the Baltic Provinces.. 516

Nast, Dr., Note from..... 484
Naville: Life Eternal..... 609
—— The Heavenly Father..... 609
New Englander.....290, 456, 602
New England Historical and Genealogical Register 125, 602
Newman: An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent..... 462
New York Institution for Deaf and Dumb. 416
North American Review.....125, 290, 456, 602
North British Review.....125, 294, 457, 603

Oliphant, John.....Page 636
Oliphant: The Minister's Wife..... 162
Only Herself..... 323
Oriental Influence on Western Thought, etc. 545
Achievements of the Alexandrian School. 546
Pernicious System of Monachism..... 548
Revenue of the Moors—Their Learning. 552
Some Striking Results of the Crusades.. 553
Influence of the Jewish Race..... 556
Influence of the Commerce of the East.. 558
Orton: The Andes and the Amazon, etc... 315
Osborn: Outlines of Wesleyan Bibliography 316
Our Spoken English..... 526
These Americanisms not a Dialect..... 526
Loss and Renewal of Sounds of Language. 530
Deficiency of our Written Notation..... 531
Dialectic Abbreviations..... 535
Independence of the Eye..... 540

Palestine, The Relief Map of..... 324
Pearson: The Cabin on the Prairie..... 163
Peck, Ira E.: A Genealogical History of the Descendants of Joseph Peck, etc. 316
Peirce: Young Shetlander and his Home.. 317
Perowne: Immortality..... 299
Politics and the Pulpit..... 189
National Sermons by Gilbert Haven..... 189
Historic Value of these Sermons..... 190
Their Prophetic Character..... 191
Their Rhetorical Excellence..... 192
Their Evangelical Philanthropy..... 193
Caste Antagonistic to the Law of Progress 197
Pope and the Council, The, by Janus..... 308
Popular Library for Young People 322, 488
Power of Mind over Nature, On the.....29, 221
1. Power of Man in Modifying the Physical Geography of the Globe..... 36
2. Influence of Mind on the Physiognomy of the Earth..... 40
3. Influence of Mind on Physique of Man. 42
4. Power of Mind to Control the Mechanical Forces of Nature, etc..... 221
5. Influence which Man exerts over the Vegetable Life of the Globe..... 224
6. Influence of Man on the Physical Development, Habits, etc., of Animals. 226
Prescott: The Prescott Memorial..... 306
Princeton Review..... 125

Quarterly Book-Table.....130, 293, 460, 604

Ramesis the Great..... 144
Ratzinger: Kirchlichen Armenpflege..... 617
Reade: The Cloister and the Hearth, etc... 162
Reavis: Saint Louis, the future Great City of the World..... 636
Recollections of Eton..... 635
Reid, Rev. John: Sorrow..... 162
Renan, Ernest..... 5
His Professorship of Hebrew in the College of France..... 6
His "Life of Jesus"..... 6
His Birth and Education..... 7
His Theological Training..... 8
He rejects the Supernatural..... 16
Renan's Idea of Immortality..... 22
Report of Board of State Commissioners of Public Charities of the State of N. Y. 163
Revue Chretienne, (Christian Review).... 479
Revue Theologique, (Theological Review.) 479
Robertson: Sermons Preached at Brighton, 635
Robinson: Stern Necessity..... 636
—— True to Herself..... 636
Romanism and the Common School System. 204
—— assails the Common School system..... 207
Desecration of the Public Money in New York City by the Romanist Party..... 209
Necessary Preparations for the Contest... 217
Duties of the Clergy on this Subject..... 218
Ryle: Expository Thoughts on the Gospels. 223

Sacred Poets, Evening with the.....Page 477
Sainte-Beuve: Nouveaux Lundis..... 5
Sawtine: Dame Nature and her Three Daughters..... 163
Schaff: History of the Apostolic Church... 313
Schmid: Der Kreampf der Lutherischen Kirche um Luthers Lehre vom Abendmahl im Reformations-zeitalter, etc... 801
Schmucker: True Unity of Christ's Church. 635
Schuyler: Logic for High School's, etc..... 467
Scripture, Inspiration of all..... 116
The True Interpretation of 2 Tim. iii, 16, stated and argued..... 110
Plenary Inspiration not a Question in Paul's Time..... 113
The True Inspiration assumed..... 113
Every Part of Inspired Scripture valuable 414
Shedd: A History of Christian Doctrine... 482
—— Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.... 482
Silver Tongue and Organist's Repertory.... 163
Simmons: A Scripture Manual..... 101
Smart: The Whisky War in Adrian, etc... 636
Smiles: Self-Help, etc..... 483
Smith: Prophecy, a Preparation for Christ. 604, 635
Southern General Conference, The..... 480
Southern Methodist Press, The.....154, 319
Southern Reconstruction, Its Obstacles, etc.
Pride of Character and of Consistency... 380
"Social Equality" feared..... 382
Southern Spirit in the Sanctuary..... 386
Treatment of Colored Laborers..... 389
Feelings toward Immigrants from the North 391
Spanish Barber, The, A Tale of the Bible in Spain..... 163
Stanley: Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church..... 151
—— Lectures on History of Jewish Church. 151
Stayman: Flowers and Fossils, etc..... 323
Steel: So Runs the World away 636
Steinmeyer: Apologetische Beitrage..... 299
Sterling: As regards Protoplasm, in relation to Prof. Huxley's Essay on the Physical Basis of Life..... 631
Stone: The Invitation He died. Reasons for a Return to Catholic Unity..... 473
Storrs: God is Love. A Sermon..... 159
—— The Judgment, etc..... 159
Studien und Kritiken.....129, 292, 458
Sublime in Nature, The..... 473
Sun, The..... 473

Taylor: Classical Study..... 484
Tennyson, The Poetical Works of..... 323
Textual Corrections of the Common English Version in the New Testament..... 462
Thackeray, The Writings of Anna Isabel... 636
The "B. O. W. C." A Book for Boys..... 323
Theological Medium..... 290
Thomson: Our Oriental Missions..... 626
Todd: The Sunset Land, etc..... 161
Tom Brown's School-days..... 484
Tourjee: The Tone Masters..... 323
Trafton: Baptism—Its Subject and Mode.. 323
Training of Deaf-Mutes..... 416
Difficulties in teaching Deaf-Mutes..... 417
Abbe de l'Epee's System..... 418
Origin of American System of Deaf-Mute Instruction..... 420
Pedro Ponce de Leon Teacher of Articulation to Deaf-Mutes..... 422
Jacob R. Pereira taught Mutes to read audibly..... 424
John Paul Bonet, Constructor of Mute Alphabet..... 424
True Stories of Real Pets..... 163
Twenty-Second Psalm, The, as Illustrating the Subjective Method of Prophetic Christological Revelation.. .....93, 366
Twenty-Second Psalm: The Psalm Classified..... .....Page 94
Describes Christ's Agony in the Garden. 99
His Agony upon the Cross.....104, 374
The Description cannot apply to David.. 106
Describes Christ's Victory.....109, 374
Inspiration and Revelat on defined..... 366
Methods adopted to communicate Supernatural Truths 369
Revelations are Objective and Subjective. 370
When the Psalm was written..... 375
Universalist Quarterly.....125, 291, 456, 602
Unkind Word, The, and other Stories..... 323
Upham, F. W.: Who they Were, and How they Came to Jerusalem..... 464
Upham, T. C.: Mental Philosophy, etc..... 472
Urlin: Wesley's Place in Church-history... 811
Verdi: Maternity..... 626
Veronica..... 636
Vick's Illustrated Catalogue and Floral Guide..... 323
Waddell: Greek Grammar for Beginners... 162
Wallace: Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection..... 620
Ward, A Memoir of Rev. Jacob..... 635
Waterbury: Memoir of Rev. J. Scudder, M.D 482
Weber und Holtzmann: Geschichte des Volkes Israel und der Enstehung des Christenthums..... 138
Webster: History of M. E. Church in Canada 636
Weiss: Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie, etc 302
Wells: Wordbook, etc..... 162
Wesley's Separation from the Moravians... 265
Causes of his Separation..... 265
Letter to the Society in Herrnhut..... 266
Attempts at Reconciliation..... 266
Conversation between Zinzendorf and Wesley..... 267
Manifesto of the Moravian Society at Marienborn 270
Diversities of Doctrine and Aim..... 273
Westminster Review.....126, 292, 457, 603
Whately: Essays on some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion..... 463
Williams: The Gospel according to Matthew 295
Wilson: Our Father in Heaven, etc..... 483
Winchell: Sketches of Creation, etc 303
Wolfe: Out in the World..... 483
Wonders of the Human Body..... 635
Wood, Rev. J. G.: Bible Animals..... 150
Woolsey: Essay on Divorce, etc..... 607
Word, The, etc 323
Wuttke on Greek Ethics..... 573
Plato: General Principles..... 573
Basis and Nature of Virtue..... 574
The Four Platonic Virtues 577
The Platonic State..... 578
The Platonic Family..... 580
Caste 581
Ethical Progress..... 582
Religious Defectiveness..... 584
Aristotle: General Principles..... 585
Nature and Kinds of Virtue..... 587
Defectiveness of the Just-mean Principle. 589
The several Virtues..... 590
Solidarity..... 592
The State..... 593
Slavery 594
Greek Ethics at its highest..... 595
Yates: Wrecked in Port..... 162
Yonge: An English-Greek Lexicon..... 476
Youmans: The First Book of Botany..... 483
Zeitschrift fur Historische Theologie...293, 4 9
Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie 293, 458

1 4581